QUOD *post tot exantlatos labores, ſummamque perfunctam operam, id moliminis quod optimo ſuſcepiſti conſilio, non minori acumine ac artificio elaboratum, tandem perfeciſti, tibi gratulamur. Satis omnibus innoteſcat, quam nullius ſint ponderis, inanis illa verborum oſtentatio & pompa, nec non prolixa Argumentorum congeries, quibus hæc ſolum aſsequutus eſt adverſarius, ut ſe & Lectores fruſtra fatigaret, & rem per ſe expeditam impediret magis & involveret. Glorientur Remonſtrantes & quicquid uſpiam eſt infauſtæ ſobolis Pelagianæ, magna Argumentorum vi & copia, ſummoque animi & ingenii niſu, Sanctorum inconcuſſam fidem, (at Satana frendente, hoſtibuſque gratiæ æſtuantibus licet,) ad finem uſque permanſuram, ſe expugnaſſe. Enimvero altum quiddam eſt Gratia Dei, & excelſum, & invictum, & infatigabile, cujus vim non percipiunt, qui oppugnant. Infeliciter dogmatis iſtius Patronis ceſſerit, qui dum ἀποϛασίαν Sanctorum aſtruere contendunt, ipſi facti ſunt Apoſtatæ: & quia efficaciſſima eſt docendi ratio, vivere ut præcipiunt, probant illi (qui ſancti etiam videri velint & haberi,) quæ aſſerunt, fieri poſſe; ſpecioſo enim ſub prætextu pium ſanctumque nomen aliquandiu ſimulantes, tandem rejiciunt, quo Religionis ſiunt* ſcopuli, *& pietatis* maculæ, *ut omnibus conſtare poſſit, hujuſmodi homunciones nec* ſanctos *fuiſſe, nec* ſancitos. *Pergas tu interim, ſis macte virtute tua & gratia Chriſti, cujus vindicias tam nervoſe egiſti, palmam, tibi litem intendentibus, adhuc præripere ſatage, ſiſque tu vivum Gratiæ documentum, & publicum Doctrinæ tuæ ſpecimen & exemplar, ut adverſarii irati licet & inviti fateri cogantur, Sanctos eſſe Sancitos.*

JOH. OWEN, Academ. Oxon. Procan.

JOS. HOYLE.

HEN. WILKINSON.

QUOD *post tot exantlatos labores, ſummamque perfunctam operam, id moliminis quod optimo ſuſcepiſti conſilio, non minori acumine ac artificio elaboratum, tandem perfeciſti, tibi gratulamur. Satis omnibus innoteſcat, quam nullius ſint ponderis, inanis illa verborum oſtentatio & pompa, nec non prolixa Argumentorum congeries, quibus hæc ſolum aſsequutus eſt adverſarius, ut ſe & Lectores fruſtra fatigaret, & rem per ſe expeditam impediret magis & involveret. Glorientur Remonſtrantes & quicquid uſpiam eſt infauſtæ ſobolis Pelagianæ, magna Argumentorum vi & copia, ſummoque animi & ingenii niſu, Sanctorum inconcuſſam fidem, (at Satana frendente, hoſtibuſque gratiæ æſtuantibus licet,) ad finem uſque permanſuram, ſe expugnaſſe. Enimvero altum quiddam eſt Gratia Dei, & excelſum, & invictum, & infatigabile, cujus vim non percipiunt, qui oppugnant. Infeliciter dogmatis iſtius Patronis ceſſerit, qui dum ἀποϛασίαν Sanctorum aſtruere contendunt, ipſi facti ſunt Apoſtatæ: & quia efficaciſſima eſt docendi ratio, vivere ut præcipiunt, probant illi (qui ſancti etiam videri velint & haberi,) quæ aſſerunt, fieri poſſe; ſpecioſo enim ſub prætextu pium ſanctumque nomen aliquandiu ſimulantes, tandem rejiciunt, quo Religionis ſiunt* ſcopuli, *& pietatis* maculæ, *ut omnibus conſtare poſſit, hujuſmodi homunciones nec* ſanctos *fuiſſe, nec* ſancitos. *Pergas tu interim, ſis macte virtute tua & gratia Chriſti, cujus vindicias tam nervoſe egiſti, palmam, tibi litem intendentibus, adhuc præripere ſatage, ſiſque tu vivum Gratiæ documentum, & publicum Doctrinæ tuæ ſpecimen & exemplar, ut adverſarii irati licet & inviti fateri cogantur, Sanctos eſſe Sancitos.*

JOH. OWEN, Academ. Oxon. Procan.

JOS. HOYLE.

HEN. WILKINSON.

SANCTI SANCITI.

Or, The COMMON

DOCTRINE

OF THE

PERSEVERANCE

OF THE

SAINTS:

As who are kept by the Power of GOD, through

Faith Unto Salvation,

VINDICATED

From the attempts lately made againſt it, by Mr. *JOHN GOODWIN*, in the DIGRESSION of his BOOK, which he was pleaſed to entitle

Redemption Redeemed.

TOGETHER WITH TWO

DIGRESSIONS:

The one maintaining a ſpecifical difference between the graces of the Saints; and whatſoever is found in men Unregenerate.

The other, aſſerting God to be the ſole Authour, of whatever difference of the Saints, from themſelves, and others.

As alſo an *APPENDIX* in Anſwer to Maſter *Horne*, goring all UNIVERSITY-LEARNING.

By *GEORGE KENDALL*, B. D. ſomtimes Fellow of *Exeter* Col. in *Oxford*.

John 6. 39. *This is the will of the Father, which hath ſent me, that of all that he hath given me, I ſhould loſe nothing, but ſhould raiſe it up again at the laſt day.*
1 John 3. 3. *And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himſelf, even as he is pure.*

LONDON, Printed by *Tho. Ratcliffe*, and *Edw. Mottershed* 1654.

OF THE

DOCTRINE

OF THE

PERSEVERANCE

OF THE

SAINTS:

As who are kept by the Power of GOD, through

Faith unto Salvation.

VINDICATED:

From the attempts lately made against it, by Mr.
JOHN GOODWIN, in his Book, which he has pleasantly entitled

Redemption Redeemed.

TOGETHER WITH

DIGRESSIONS

The one preliminary, specifical, different Character of the Spirit of
the Saints, and whatever is found in their Regeneration.

The other, affirming God to be the Holy Author, and the
difference of the Saints, from themselves, and

As also an APPENDIX in Answer to Mr. [illegible]
going all UNIVERSITY-LEARNING.

By GEORGE KENDALL, B. D. formerly Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.

LONDON, Printed by [illegible] and Tho. Maxfield, [illegible]

AD ALMAM MATREM Academiam OXONIENSEM.

LIceat mihi, bonâ tuâ cum veniâ (Veneranda Mater) dissertatiunculârum mearum de Gratiâ Divinâ partem alteram (quæ Sanctorum Perseverantiam, Augustissimum Privilegium, ab inanibus nescio quibus captiunculis, vindicandam suscepit,) sacro nomini tuo, summâ, quâ decet reverentiâ, paucis consecrare. Scilicet, calamus meus, ab uno, alarum tuarum, gratioso præsidio, tuta omnia, fœliciáq; pollicetur, & Authori, & Argumento. Abundè meminit satis supèrque cùm ornatam, tum munitam fuisse hanc provinciam, multis retrò annis, ab illustrissimis filiis tuis, Reverendissimis Ecclesiæ Patribus, Abbotio, & Prideauxio: *certè tam inclytorum nominum vel levis umbra, pro umbone mihi erit adversus tela* Godviniana; *tantum interest, inter magnos illos Heroas, & bonum hunc virum; cujus ingentia fulmina, satis innocua crepitacula sunt, & non nisi ludicrum terrorem incutiunt bruto fragore. Quanquam enim attonita ad hæc stupeant tenella quædam ingenia, quibus orationis tumor, pro rerum pondere, & verborum fremitus, pro rationum momento est, adeò tamen levia & cava sunt omnia, ad justum examen paulò pressiùs reducta, ut nullus dubitem, quin imbellia hæc jacula, & toto pectore illæsus excipiam, & in frontem Authoris, si qua supersit, non sine suo discrimine, facilè retorqueam; fulgentibus quidem usus est armis, non usus est fortibus. In eo uno prudentem se*

præbuit, quòd idonea tempora delegit, ad infelicem hanc pugnam, feliciùs instaurandam; quippe quæ quotidie eadem tot insignes transfugas, qui unà praxi suâ nimis confirmâsse videantur, quicquid argumentis omnibus frustrà contenderant; nempe conscii sibi, quam parùm profecerant inermi disputatione, aliâ viâ aggrediendum putârunt, & irrefragibile documentum dederunt suæ Ἀποστασίας; *& quasi sperarent se cedendo victuros, & inhonestâ fugâ faciliùs erecturos glorioſius trophæum, hi ad Romanas Aquilas, illi ad Socinianos Graculos, alii ad rapaciores Vultures, & sordidiores Harpyas indignè avolàrunt, & fictitii Sancti abièrunt, in veros Apostatas. At certus loquor, (sanctissima Mater) inter omnes, qui ad Pontificiorum, Photinianorum, Libertinorum partes desciverunt, nemo unquam totus stetit à Dei, & tuis. Oblivisci non poteris, qualia fuerint politula illa ingenia, ascititiorum quorundam, & tantùm Nomine tenus tuorum, quos prostibula ista, & propudia, merito stigmate jam olim inusta, deperiisse non pudunt. Quæquot superstitiones & ineptias istas ardent, frigidè semper coluerunt quicquid est veræ Religionis. Toti fuerunt in extimâ quadam Histrionicæ Pietatis simbriâ, quæ de vultu, vestitu, & id genus maximis, nescio quibus, reculis, aut veriùs umbris, maximè solicita est, de majoribus secura. Maluerunt sancti viri, capita denudare, quàm corda; genua flectere, quàm animos; curiosiores erant in noctibus (ut mitiùs dicam) Atticis, quàm Diebus Dominicis observandis; diligentiores in Rhetorculorum, Philosophastrorum, Rabularum, Scholasticorum, saltem floridiorum Patrum fragmentis, quàm crassioribus Prophetarum, & Apostolorum Paginis, non sine tædio evolvendis; Peritiores in lepido Epigrammate, aut salsâ Comœdiâ, quàm in sacris concionibus adornandis; scilicet hasce etiam lusisse videbantur; adeo illis seriò pios esse, una Religio fuit. Minimè tui erant, etiam cùm maximè fuisse viderentur.*

Quod nimis testatum dederunt, festivis declamatiunculis suis in Magnos illos viros, & non sine curâ quadam Reverentiæ dicendos, Lutherum, Calvinum, *alióſque Beatissimæ memoriæ Doctores, quos solenne iis fuit, ut turpissimos Ecclesiæ Deformatores, populari odio, & risui sacrificare. Fallitur quisquis somniaverit, eos fidem deseruisse, qui perfidiam suam dissimulare, honestè desièrunt; & quales semper fuerint, tandem & apparent: nisi enim lac tuum* ἄδολον, *ab ipsis cunis, secreto quodam fastidio semper nauseâssent,*

nun-

nunquàm vino illo πορνείας, se apertè proluissent; quibus tua unquam grata fuerunt, vappa ista semper futura est, non tantùm insipida, sed & amara.

Ecquis non stomachabitur, Sacris Dei Oraculis indignè posthabitis, fatuas deliratorum vetularum traditiunculas, delusæ Ecclesiæ impudenter propinari? Literis Θεοπνεύστοις prorsus neglectis, somnolentorum patrum canonas & decreta, Christiano orbi, quasi sub jugum actio, insolentius obtrudi? Sanctissimis, celeberrimorum Conciliorum placitis passim despectis, Unius (credite) infallibilis cathedræ sententiolam, in obtenebratâ æde Dei imperiosè dominari? Quis crederet bellos istos homulos, nimios olim liberæ Philosophiæ cultores, ad tam servile genus fidei, patienter demissos, & curiosos arcanorum omnium etiam cœlestium rimatores ad cæcam quam vocant, superiorum obedientiam placidè compositos? Quis non miretur, quo novo inaudito artificii glutine, Socinianam licentiam, & Papisticum obsequium tam egregiè conjunxerint? Non opus est anxiâ indagatione, scilicet re Libertini, Dogmatum omnium ut ἀσυστάτων farraginem facilè concoxerunt, & ad animi sui temperiem tepidâ quadam prudentiâ satis commodè emolliverunt; dicam verbulo, εἰς ἐκπτωσιν τῆς πλάνης ex justissimo Dei judicio miserè delapsi sunt, quia sacram veritatem (quod jure sibi vendicaverat,) animitùs complecti fastidiosè recusârunt. Neque enim expectandum fuit, ut Dei Spiritus illos ab hac tristi ruina, tueri dignaretur, qui eum aut non posse, aut non velle audaciùs deblaterârunt. Si diis placet, indignum arbitrati sunt nimium servari, & satius duxerunt libertati suæ (heu quàm charæ!) perennidi relinqui, quàm ad certam salutem injuriâ Dei solicitudine curiosiùs custodiri; & eò effrontis audaciæ tandem devenerunt, ut Doctrinam hanc ipsam de Perseverantiâ quasi maximam Ἀποστασίας illicem, pro authoritate suâ (hem quàm gravi!) supercilioſè damnarent.

At dicant, quotquot uspiam sunt Sancti omnes, annon hoc eos à lapsu felicissimè defendat, quod ab uno Deo defendi se sciant; nimium conscii, quàm proni rituri sint in omne genus flagitia, sibi concessi. Sentiunt (quod olim Tertullianus) adeò fortem esse Carnem, ut Spiritum elidat; Unus timor præstat securos, at & Una confidentia divini favoris, feliciter cautos, & ad omnes tentationum incursus, sancto metu tremebundos. Ubi gentium reperiemus tam sedulos, & solicitos Dei servos, quam qui se filios, hæredes, ipsius

Christi cohæredes esse, & verè credunt, & humiliter gloriantur? Quàm sterilis semper fuit semianimis illa Pontificiorũ dubitatio præ Evangelicorum vivaciori & exultabundâ certitudine? quàm exucca illorum opera, vt vt maximè speciosa, tumida, & turgentia, præ solidiori illâ abnegatione sui, quâ nostri & Deo & hominibus se probare studuerint? si quid aliud efficit, ut nosmet serò abnegemus, certè hoc est, quòd constat nobis, Deum nostrum seipsum abnegare non posse; nec magis seipsum, quàm servos suos, quotquot fuerint, licèt prorsus inutiles, tamen verè fideles; ita adamantino quodam vinculo connexuisse gratiam et gloriam, ut cui alteram dederit, alteram non denegaverit. Hinc oriri solet Generosior ille, et heroicus Sanctorum zelus, quo Deo quibus tantum debent, totos se devovent, et verecundâ quadam fiduciâ, ad cœlestia aspirantes, terrena omnia Christianissimo fastu conculcant. Rancidas istas calumnias, quibus Doctrinam hanc de Perseverantiâ perfundere non erubuit splendida insolescentium adversariorum bilis, vel soli abstersisse potuerant integerrimi Reverendorum Doctorum mores, qui non tam scripsisse Apologias, quàm vixisse videantur. Maluerunt Sanctæ animæ Christo et Ecclesiæ fideliter inservire, quàm in felicissimo amplissimorum regnorum imperio longè latèque Dominari; plùs illis placuit vel crassa Toga, cum purâ conscientia, quàm etiam oblata purpura Cardinalitia, quam aliqui ex illis ad pedes suos prostratam, ut pulcherrimam turpissimæ Apostasias mercedem, curioso quodam neglectu, indignabundi conculcârunt. Noriũt adversarii sordescentem suam purpuram, si quo alio certè horum fulgore maximè ornandam, at maluerunt illi detritum et lacerum quemvis pannum, modò splendidissimo Christi Pallio coopertum. Cogitabant se peregrinari in hoc seculo, nec curæ illis fuit, quales incederent, modò rectâ ad Patriam; quin et denudatos se mallent, quo durum iter celeriùs conficerent, quàm onerosâ mundi pompâ infeliciùs prægravatos; missam hanc fecerunt bonis illis animalculis, quæ ex putri (quod aiunt) materiâ creata, ex iisdem nutriuntur, quibus et vivunt; non fecit hæc ad palatum animarum illarum verè cœlestium, et (ut cum Tertulliano *loquar) Christi generosarum. Nulla illis bona fuerunt, nisi quæ redderent meliores; vnas Divitias existimarunt, paucis contentos esse; et in obscuris laribus, sed quos virtutibus suis satis illustrârant glorioſè delitescentes, Palatia ipsa, turrésque Babylonicas, solo simpliciorum verborum impetu, felicissimè conquassâ-*

quaſſârunt. In eo toti fuerunt, ut Doctrinæ ſuæ Evangelicæ divinam ſimplicitatem, pari morum tenore, ſine fuco, ornarent. Scilicet his olim moribus vivebatur, à ſanctiſſimis illis Eccleſiarum Reformatarum Proceribus, quos vel eo nomine venerari ſoleo, ut ſumma ſinceræ pietatis exemplaria, quòd digni reperti ſint, qui à venenatis, non magìs ſcurrilium, quàm ridiculorum nebulonum, linguis, & calamis, altiùs tranſfoderentur; non niſi invidendo, Jeſu Chriſti ſtigmate, clariùs inuſti. Dulce, & decorum, illis ſemper fuit, audire etiam Apoſtatas, dum in vera Chriſti fide, omni opprobriorum genere onuſti, conſtanter perſeverarent; & optimi permanerent, etiam cum mali cujuſcunque nobiliore infamiâ. Quinimo, ſordet mihi omnino, (ut taceam nuperas iſtas Sanctorum Larvas, quas nudius tertius nobis exhibuit Legenda, tam ſtylo, quàm titulo ſuo, verè lignea,) ſordet inquam decantatiſſima, fraterculorum Monaſticorum, Pietas, præ, penè dixeram, honeſtioribus Orthodoxorum delictis; hi laudabiliùs ceſpitârunt, quàm iſti rectâ incedunt; nempe iſti bonis opuſculis ſuis (prob quantillis!) debitam, neſcio quam, mercedem, pro inflatâ Arrogantiâ ſuâ, vendicare didicerunt, malis etiam veniam; præſertim ubi ſatisfactiunculis ſuis, egregiis certè, ut verbo utar Afro-Latino, omnino diſpunxerint. Hi ſicubi leviſſimè oberraverint, ſe æternis ſuppliciis jure obnoxios eſſe, ſummo cum dolore liberè profeſſi ſunt, & in unâ gratuitâ Dei miſericordiâ, ſpem omnem abſolutionis repoſuerunt; ubi optima omnia, omnium optimè præſtiterint, ab unâ vicariâ morte Domini Jeſu Chriſti Eleemoſynariam *vitam expectârunt; Deo ſoli accepta referentes, et præmia ſua, et opera, nihil ſibi tribuere auſi, præter unum peccatum. Quàm verò triſti diligentiâ ſemper abuſi ſunt in peccatis ſuis meritis elogiis turpiùs inſigniendis? etiam calorem omnem animi clamoſè incuſârunt; et aliquantulum calumniari mallent quàm non ſatìs damnare; ſcintillulas iſtas concupiſcentiæ, quas alii luſtrali aquâ facilè purgant, hi æternis flammis ſeveriùs adjudicârunt; otioſam quamque voculam, aut vagam cogitatiunculam pari ſupplicio mulctandam rigidè decreverunt; ubi alii interim aut obſervato unius horulæ ſilentio, aut obmurmuratâ breviori aliquâ, præſcriptæ orationis formulâ, faciliùs redimunt. Quid miri? in tanta Mediatorum Interceſſorúmque novorum agmina, gratiſſimo ſimul et utiliſſimo errore, non ità pridem inciderunt fœlicia hæc Capita. Illi*

verò

verò quem habuêre in cælis præter unum Christum? et nisi ipse solus salvos, præstiterit pereant omnes, æternúmque pereant miserrimi, nimis necesse est.

Non licuit illis tam vili peccare, quorum culpæ tantò cariùs eluendæ erant; et etiam post Christi sanguinem, tantam vim lachrymarum suarum obstinatiùs efflagitârunt. At Deus bone, quàm facile erit bonis Papicolis, vel jejuniis suis, satis delicatis, animorum suorum superbiam secretiùs alere? ciliciis suis, arrogantiam perversiùs ornare? ex cineribus suis, densiores ambitionis fumos, subtiliùs anhelare? ferreis virgulis suis recalcitrantis carnis impetus, acriùs incitare? denique ex simulatâ paupertate otiosiùs ditescere? Quid quæso habet tota illa Theatricæ Pœnitentiæ Pompa, quòd cum seriâ mortificatione comparari mereatur? ergóne tam difficile est crucis signum pectoribus imprimere, quàm Christi jugum cervicibus imponere? et quod durissimum sonat carnalibus auribus, ipsi justitiæ nostræ tristes renunciare, et pœnitentiæ ipsi novas pœnas deberi, non pro more agnoscere, sed ex intimis contriti cordis recessibus, et sentire et lugere? scilicet hoc est nostris Pœnitere; offensantes oculos non tam lachrymis delere, quàm strictiori curâ effodere; dextras acutiori Spiritûs gladio excindere; et in omnes non corporis, sed animæ partes voluntariâ ultione sævire; et continuo cruciatu pene extinctis, redivivam mortem, eámque æternam minari, unâ Christi morte liberandis; tanti illis constitit, Reformata sua Pœnitentia; Expectavit illa ut cujus eos semel pœnituerat, semper puderet, et ut animæ, licet Christi sanguine elotæ, ad candorem, sui tamen rubore totæ perfunderentur; expectavit illa ut culpæ istius semper meminerint, cujus Deus oblitus est; & ut imperatam precandi audaciam piæ hujus verecundiæ mixturâ temperare curarent.

Doctrina nostra Reformata, promittit quidem credentibus veniam, veniam adeptis Perseverantiam, sed Perseverantiam non magis fidei quàm Pœnitentiæ. Ecquis verò in peccato persistere præsumat, eò quod in peccati cujusvis semel admissi, non abrumpendâ pœnitentiâ semper Perseveraturum se esse crediderit? Doctrina de Perseverantiâ, lapsos quidem erigit ad suaviorem spem veniæ pœnitentibus suspiriis, & ejulatibus, opportunè impetrandæ non obdurat lapsuros, contra præcipitii, aut periculum, aut horrorem; imo nihil frequentiùs ingerit., quàm ut qui stant, etiam in tutissimo,

videant

videant vel toto ſuſpicionis obtutu, ne triſtiſſimè cadant, ruántque, & ſibi diffiſi, toti pendeant à Deo, qui ſolus potis eſt & ſuſtentare ne cadant, & ubi ceciderint reſuſcitare ne pereant. Id maximè urget, ut pretioſis Dei promiſſis humiliter innixi, modeſtâ audaciâ ab eo contendant, ut Præceptis ejus tenaciùs inhæreant, & σωτηρίαν ἐξεργάζωνται, non ſine jucundo metu, & læto tremore. Monet non magis caveant ſibi, à pœna, quàm peccato, nec miſerius putent, ſupplicia ſolvere, quàm debere; ut ſe ſibi eò moleſtiùs iratos habeant, quò Deum ſentiunt faciliùs placatum; & quò certiorem veniam ab illo expectant, eò ſeveriorem vindictam, à ſeipſis repoſcant. Hoc maximè angit, urítque animos verè Chriſtianos, quod tota vitæ ſeries non per omnia reſpondeat, & Clementiſſimi Patris Mandatis, & ſuis votis; quòd ſit cui Deus ignoſcat, cujus vel Diabolus inſimulet, quòd voluntatem Dei, minùs accuratè præſtent in terris, quàm aliquando tandem præſtituri ſunt in cœlis; quòd beatis Angelis, & animabus juſtorum hominum jam perfectis, *à quibus felicitate ſuperantur, ſanctitate cedant; quòd non ſunt ſancti,* ut Deus ipſe ſanctus eſt, *& quòd ex ſumma cœli indulgentiâ θείαν φύσιν ſortitis ἀνθρώπινόν τι ex innata carnis infirmitate quaſi per inſidias obrepat. Voluptates iſtæ quæ carni blandiſſimè adulantur, Spiritui importunè moleſtæ ſunt; illecebræ omnes ſtimuli ſunt, & quales ſeriò optant piæ animæ, non ingrato, etiam mortis aculeo, radicitus effoſſos; hoc illis ſummum felicitatis eſt gravi leviorum libidinum ſarcinâ exoneratos, & à durioribus mollioris carnis vinculis liberatos, ſpiritualibus deliciis totos vacare. Cœlum ipſum affectant, non tam ut Gaudii atrium, quàm Sanctitatis arcem; in quam ſi turpi alicui, aut terreſtri aditus pateſceret, Cœlum etiam in Cœlo miſerrimè deſiderarent. Dicam quod res eſt, quoties contigit mihi incidere in elaboratiores iſtas, & vehementiores orationes, quibus Adverſariis familiare eſt, Doctrinam noſtram atrociùs inceſſere, ut Pietati inimicam, ſuam inſolentiùs efferre ut de ea, immane quantum, merituram, toties vidiſſe mihi viſus ſum, quàm ſuperficiarium ſit, & umbratile Sanctimoniæ Genus, quo boni viri tantopere ſibi placent, & aliis ſe venditant; quàm hoſpites ſint, in interiori, ſynceræ Pietatis, ſacrario; quàm parùm intelligant, in reconditioribus, ſalutiferæ ſanctificationis, myſteriis; quantùm, rem ſuam agant, ubi Apoſtatarum iſtorum, quos nos τύπῳ quodam, & imagine Pietatis, contentos eſſe jubemus, illi contrà ſum-*

mis, eximiæ Sanctitatis, elogiis, operosè honestant; scilicet illorum interest ne isti fuerint Hypocritæ, ut ipsi sint Sancti; qui forsan infra istos aliquantulum substitisse, certè non multum supra istos surrexisse se sentiunt.

Qualis enim, bo ne Deus! fumus hic Pietatis est, quem Dei promissa facilè solvant in licentiam, quique quò plura sibi à Deo polliceatur eò pauciora Deo retribuenda esse pro miro gratitudinis suæ genio, & agnoscat & curet! qualis est ἀτμὶς & halitus iste Sanctitatis, qui sibi persuaserit, non diutiùs opus esse suis precibus, ubi semel constiterit, de Dei beneplacito; & supervacaneum existimet ea orationibus efflagitare, quæ Deus dare ultro decreverat, idque ab æterno!

Veretur forsan meliùs morata hæc Pietas, ne Deum nimis fatiget, inanibus, simul & importunis officiis; ne non satis decenter, & civiliter se gerat, si Deum Promissi sui & juramenti memorem esse jusserit. Haud equidem plus quàm ridere soleo, quum tam seriæ nugæ, & solennia ludibria, excidant lutulentis quibusdam, vulgarium Arminianastrorum, fæcibus; nec multùm me commoverunt, in egregiis quibusdam viris, Doctoratu suo precario venerabilibus, precum et veræ venerationis adeò insigniter doctis, ut dignissimi essent, qui à Sacris forent, Honoratissimo Domino Baccho Baroni de Ventre, Comiti Palatino de Crapulâ, Clementissimo Domino Abaddon Illustrissimo Principi Tenebrarum et Terrorum, et exercituum omnium in Inclyta Republicâ Hobsianâ, aut fœderatis bonæ, quam vocant, Societatis Provinciis, Capitaneo Generali: At in Reverendo Godvino *meo, tam assiduo, tam solicito throni divini cliente, adeò pudendum, miserrimæ hallucinationis, prodigium, nec mirari quidem, nec abominari satis possum. Ergóne ea postulare solet nova viri Pietas, ut Deus vel quæ ab æterno non decreverat quasi pro re nata ordinare voluerit; vel ut inconsultiora decreta prudentiùs rescinderet? Non audet fides nostra cœlestem Patrem, tam inverecundè sollicitare; nobis in usu est, bona omnia, eò diligentiùs petere, quò ille benigniùs promittere dignatus est; et eò magis pertinaciter precari, quò magis illum Promissi pœnitere non potest; Langueścerent prorsus exanimatæ nostræ preculæ, quibus à Deo Perseverantiam contendimus, si oboriri posset, vel minima suspicio, Deum non satis sibi constare; et quæ olim filiis suis indulgentiùs destinaverat, aliquando tandem nimis ingratis, im-*

mori-

morigeris, & majeſtatem ejus quotidie provocantibus, indignabundum denegare. Fides noſtra uni immutabilis Dei conſtantiæ, ſe innixi profitetur; & quò certiùs illum certò conceſſurum, ſingulare iſtud Perſeverantiæ donum, ſibi perſuaſum eſt, eò ut confidentiùs expectat, ità & obſtinatiùs poſtulat; adeò pia illa confidentia, Devoti animi cuſpidem, non retundere ſolet, ſed ſuaviùs exacuere, & fortiùs indurare.

Reſpondeat mihi aliquantiſper prudentior aliqua Eccleſiolæ Godvinianæ *Matrona. Demus venerabilem Paſtorem dignatum promittere ſe Colloquio alicui apud ædes Matronæ habendo, ſtato die interfuturum; illámque non ſine ſummâ lætitiâ, ſibi gratulatam, eum iniquiores, ardentiorum diſputationum exceſſus, ſi qui, quod abſit, contigerint, pro ſuſpiciendâ ſuâ gravitate, æquâ moderatione, eruditè temperaturum.*

Illum verbo ſuo non conſtiturum vel dubitare nefas eſt. At nunquid Matrona officio ſuo non defuerit, niſi ad horam ſtatutam, Reverendum Dominum, per emiſſariam ancillam, ſupplex compellaverit, & ad domum ſuam repetitâ ſolemnitate, denuò invitaverit? Deerit certè maxime; Niſi clariſſimo viro jam præ foribus aſtanti, aut conciliabulum petenti, ſi ipſa fortè obvium ſe dederit, ut intrare non gravetur, iterum humiliter rogaverit; Niſi intrantem etiam demiſſo vultu poſtulet, ut Reverentiæ ejus, quòd priùs gratioſè promiſerat, jam non illibenter præſtare, placuerit; Niſi, ubi colendiſſimos Pulmones, opportuno plaſmate, officioſè colluerit, iterum pari cum obſervantiâ obſecraverit, ut promiſſi ſui memor, in Cathedram tanto Doctori ſe proſternere paratam, recipere ſe voluerit; Niſi in Cathedrâ collocatum, & pingui pulvinari, honorificè ſuffultum, (ne quid in ſede Apoſtolicâ periculoſè moleſtum ſit,) continuatâ venerationis ſerie precetur, ut ſi Sanctitati ſuæ viſum fuerit, Patrem Luminum aliquantiſper invocaverit; Niſi, ubi totus chorus Amen ſuum accinerit, rurſus inclinatis genibus, Paternitatem ejus oret, ut multùm optatas diſputationes tempeſtivè exordiatur; Niſi ubi plùs juſto incaluerint Diſputationes, Syllogiſmorum laqueos & Enthymematum (vah profanorum!) plicas, pro zelo ſuo dedignatæ, frigidam infundat Matrona, modeſtiori interpellatione; & debitas gratias agens ſpectatiſſimo Domino Præſidi, quòd tantam vim chari ſudoris, impendere non recuſaverit, pudicâ quadam importunitate obteſtetur, ne gravitati

ſuæ moleſtum ſit, opus hucuſq; tam feliciter progreſſum, ad ſperatum finempari ſucceſſu, pro Dignitatis ſuæ patientiâ perducere.

Fallor idque turpiſſimè, aut longum hunc brevicularum obſecrationum ordinem, Matronam ſatis decere, nec ipſi Domino Godvino, ommino diſplicere, aut ſolere, aut poſſe arbitramur omnes. Rudis prorſus ſit neceſſe eſt, in eo Chriſtianæ Pietatis, non tam myſterio, quàm elemento, quod orationes noſtras inſtruendas ſuſceperit, quiſquis dixerit, vel certam Perſeverantiam, reddere preces inanes, vel non inanes preces, arguere Perſeverantiam incertam, & in humanæ libertatis æquilibrio pendulam, & ambiguam.

Sed nec calculos ſuos feliciùs inſtituunt, qui Doctrinam de Perſeverantiâ, ut exhortationibus repugnantem, non minùs protervis, quàm ineruditis contumeliis lacerant & proſcindunt; & quanquam plenis velis ferri ſibi videntur, in hoc certè, ſi quo alio argumento, populari aurâ faventiùs aſpirante, nullibi tamen triſtiùs in ſcopulos impingunt, nimis eminentes, aut miſeriùs naufragium faciunt, etiam optato in portu.

Quis enim tam peregrinus eſt in Sacro Codice, ut latere eum poſſit, quàm frequenter Spiritus Dei illa à nobis exegerit, quæ ipſe & nos non poſſe conſtanter aſſeruit & ſe præſtiturum eſſe, indulgentiùs promiſit?

Efficite vobis inquit Cor novum, nos autem ne corda, magis quàm corpora alia effingere poſſe, non ſemel innuit. Qui capillum album atro commutare non poſſumus, quo novo carmine Cor ſaxeum emolliemus in carneum? ne metuite inquit ego effectum dabo; vos modò humiliter agnoſcite, veſtri quidem officii eſſe hoc facere, hoc fieri, meæ gratiæ.

Non abſimiliter de Perſeverantiâ hac noſtrâ Philoſophari amamus; nec hodierna Miniſtrorum monita, cum Antiquis Dei promiſſis, & æternis decretis, infeliciùs conciliamus. Et licet Dominus Godvinus, neſcio quæ, conferta, Metaphyſicalium ſubtilitatum, agmina, in adverſum produxerit, more ſuo, non ſine minabundâ quadam, Magiſterialis fiduciæ, Pompâ; quid nitamen, dicam omnia adeò peſſum data, adeò funditus deleta, ut ne vel una ſemianimis notiuncula ſuperſit, quæ conculcatas ſocias ſuas, vel infauſto cum honore ſepeliat? Nullibi mihi minor eſt vir Doctus, quàm ubi major ſeipſo incedere videtur, & ut ità dicam,

cam, ſummâ cum ſolennitate venditare ſe geſtiens, Metaphyſicis ſenticetis, oviculas ſuas, ut ut optimè lanatas, de induſtriâ irretit. Liceat per me bono Gregi, novella omnia, Cani Paſtoris, commenta, effuſè extollere, nec omnino capere; nec ægrè fero lucubratiunculas meas à Cathedris Academicis plùs quàm pro merito ſuo publicè laudatas; à Reverendiſſimis Patribus, Clariſſimis Eccleſiaſtici cœli luminibus, Uſſerio, Hallo, Bronrigio, *privatim probatas; ab aliis non infimæ ſphæræ & tantùm non primæ magnitudinis ſtellis, in utrâq; Academiâ, non ſine ſummis gratiis acceptas; à Doctiſſimis Paſtoribus ſymmyſtis meis pretioſiſſimis gemmis, & in ruſtico cœno fulgore ſuo micantibus, & ſplendentibus, chariſſimis ſymbolis decoratas, à piis hiſce agnellis ſeveriori balatu damnari. Scilicet pro tribunali ſiſtebantur* Kendalliana; *& poſt examen, (ecquis dubitare auſit?) eruditum, juſtùmque, viſum eſt Sacræ Synodo, argutias, dicteria, deliria, ferire, ſurdo quodam, exhorrendi Anathematis ſui, fulmine; & ne venerandus Paſtor inceptæ Reſponſioni ulterius impalleſcat communi decreto ſolanniùs ſtatutum eſt. Tantóſne honores ſperare auſit ſubruſticus ſacerdos, ad obſcura, Cornubienſis eremi latibula, jam olim damnatus, & in hunc uſque diem non improvidè deliteſcens in cæcis illis ſpeluncis, Arabiæ ſuæ, nomine,* Felicis, *re* Petroſæ; *et miſellis umbraculis, terræ ſuæ Beatulæ, quæ ità dicta eſt à* beando, *ut vicini montes à* movendo, *quia cœlo ipſi horrendiſſimis tempeſtatibus mugienti, immoti minantur? Tantóſne honores ſperare præſumat tantilla iſta Theologi umbra, ut celeberrimi Doctoris caſtigationibus, illuſtrari mereatur? Illéne verò magnus* Ariſtarchus *qui in Collegium Sionenſe, pro meritis ſuis ſeveriùs animadverterat, Synodum Dordracenam, uno vel altero* Spiritu *animoſiùs diffiaverat, è Senatoribus Anglicanis alios, non multis ab hinc annis ſtylo ſuo audaciùs percuſſerat, et infra pedes ſuos, ipſumque Orcum, facillimè dejecerat; alios paucis ab hinc menſibus, Quæſtionibus ſuis ſic dicunt Tormenta, familiariùs interrogaverat, et liberè monuerat ne ſomniarent ſe obligatos, ad fidem Chriſti authoritate ſuâ ſartam tectam tuendam, plùs quàm Imperatorem Turcicum ad Religionem Mahometanam, ſceptro ſuo, et gladio protegendam, propagandamque. Illéne qui effecit, ut ſtyli ſui aciem etiam mortui ſentirent, et fatales gladios, præ illo hebeſcere faterentur, à quo etiam qua ſemper victuros ſe ſperare auſi erant, triſtiorem perpeſſi ſunt, famæ cædem? (Tan-*

ti illis conſtitit, non idem, cum magno hoc, in re Theologica, Cenſore, et ſentire, et dicere.) Illéne novatæ Britanniæ jam Grandævus Patriarcha, cujus Diſcipuli penè omnes Doctores ſunt, et cujus Membra, ut loqui amant, totius mundi capita eſſe jamdudum meruerunt? Illéne cujus effigiem, jam pridem lambunt, non Hederæ, ſed lauriæ ſequaces, loquacéſque? Illéne in cujus umbrâ debitis carminibus ornandâ Poeſis ipſa deſudare videbatur; ab ipſo poſtea non minores gratias relatura, etiam ſuis metris; utpote quibus, ipſæ Muſæ non immeritò ſuperbiant? Scilicet Hymni Godviniani *non minùs ſuperârunt* Buchananianos, *quàm copiæ Anglicanæ Legiones Scoticas. Illéne ſub cujus leviorum chartularum ſatís gravi pondere, tot plauſtra ſuccubuerunt, etiam ſub grato lætóque onere feſſa et gemebunda? Illéne cujus grandiora volumina, fragrantiſſimum nomen ejus, et multo thure piperéq; meritò redolentiſſimum, ſeris Nepotibus ſuaviſſimè commendaverint? Illéne, tantum nomen, cum tam contemnendo adverſario committi dicetur? Fruſtrá expectet nanulus iſte, ut Æneæ magni dextrâ cadat,* Dignum illum Cæſaris irâ, nullus honor faciet. *Imo prodeant inſtructiſſimi, Cantabrigienſium Copiarum, Duces, quos tantus noſter* Hercules *etiam abjectâ clavâ ſuâ torviori nutu debellare dignetur. Non tam facile eſt illi Duos imò Ducentos provocare quàm proſternere; Quod ſi cum eo pro prudentiâ ſuâ contendere detrectaverint, quid reſtat, niſi ut novum hunc Reformati orbis* Atlantem, *Proni venerentur omnes, et vel ſputum ejus grati delambant; et par agnoſcant ipſi jactatiſſimo incautiorum Martyrum ſanguini, cui tamen pepercíſſent boni viri, ſi tam perſpicaci monitore, cæcis iſtis ſæculis, gaudere contigiſſet. Scilicet non eſt cur tam invictus Heros, ad ignobile duellum ſe demittat, cum rudiori Tyrone, ſaltem emerito* Decanulo, (*quo ſolo titulo in hunc uſque diem, gloriari videtur, bonus iſte* Tityrus,) *irrefragabili ſilentio nimis confutandus. Satis controverſiarum habet cum incultiori grege ſuo de lanâ caprinâ, ex quacucullum conficiat eruditione ſua dignum.*

Summas gratias habeo Doctiſſimo huic conventui, cujus benevolo contemptu tantum chari otii mihi feliciter indultum eſt, *At iſta non prohibent, quin ego meipſum, certè non ſine honore devorandum, Theologico huic* Polyphemo *ſecundò objiciam; nec diſpliceat tibi (Mater honoratiſſima) inconſultæ hujus audaciæ meæ exitum pauliſper expectare, mihi forſan ſatìs infeli-*

cem,

cem, at veritati, quod nullus dubito, non inglorium.

Quod ſupereſt, Deum veneror, ut incomparabiles inconcuſſæ veritatis vires, clariùs ex filiorum tuorum omnium obſirmatâ Pietate, quàm digladiationibus hiſce meis, nimio quàm levibus, Anglicano orbi, qua qua patet innoteſcant; ut inter omnes, omnium adverſariorum, arietationes, filii tui omnes ſemper feliciter ſibi conſtent, veritati cedant; ut in bonis omnibus, et laudabilibus, piâ quadam obſtinatione, uſque & uſq; perſeverent; ut innatæ ſuæ, cùm infirmitatis, tum corruptionis conſcii, in neceſſarium, divinæ gratiæ, adjutorium, toti recumbant, eóque confidentiùs, quò humiliùs; ut in magìs arduis myſteriis, & humano ingenio inacceſſis, præferant ſobriam ignorantiam, intemperantiori ſapientiæ; ut prudenter agnoſcant, modeſtius quoddam eruditionis genus eſſe, nonnihil patienter neſcire; ut in omnibus Dei decretis, venerabundâ admiratione acquieſcant, ad omnia Præcepta curioſâ diligentiâ invigilent; ut nec de iſtis fuſiùs loquantur, nec de his parciùs; utpote qui probè nôrint, ſe nec iſta ſatìs ſcire poſſe, nec hæc facere; ut ſeriò cogitent ſe omnem omnibus præceptis obedientiam debere, nulli præſtare; ut nec maximæ obedientiæ mercedem, inſolentiùs ſibi arrogent, nec de minimæ præmio diffidentùs dubitent; ut illorum animis magìs magiſque indies ingenerent, comminationes legales piam curam, Promiſſiones Evangelicæ magìs piam, non minùs cautam confidentiam; ut inter metum & ſpem felici integritate quaſi diviſi, Deo Chriſtóque ſuo inviolabili unione adhæreant, atque & ipſi ſeriò profiteantur ſe nihil poſſe, & nos læti experiamur eos omnia poſſe, per Dominum ſuum Jeſum Chriſtum; infinitâ ejus Potentiâ, in confeſſâ illorum infirmitate, glorioſiùs triumphante; ut quos præceptis docent exemplis ducant, bene expertos magìs infractam eſſe Sanctæ vitæ, quàm eruditæ linguæ ἐνέργειαν; *ut contabeſcant invidi omnes, & obliqui, malignantis Cœtûs ocelli; ut veritatis Chriſtianæ ſanctè ſtudioſi, maximo in lucro reponant, ſe ſummis omnibus dignos, ad infima damnatos eſſe; & cæcas quietiorum latibulorum tenebras, ſuâ luce nobiliùs illuſtrent; & in medio Perverſæ gentis rectiores, erectiores incedant, ſéque à malevolorum omnium obtrectatorum calumniis, patienti quadam æquanimitate vindicare pergant; ut Deus pro infinitâ ſuâ gratiâ, Sanctos ſuos omnes ſemper defendat, quo con-*

conſtantiſſimè perſeverent, quos nos per gratiam ejus defenſos ſemper feliciter perſeveraturos eſſe, in quali quali opuſculo hoc noſtro, pro quam Deus *conceſſit, tenui facultatulâ, cum eodem bono* Deo *defendemus.*

Ita animitus precatur,

Datum ex clauſtris meis in Terrâ Beatâ Cornub. *pridie Kalend.* Sep. MDCLIII.

Tuus, Tuorúmque, & quotquot uſpiam ſunt ſanctorum omnium, indigniſſimus quidem ſed & devotiſſimus in Domino noſtro Ieſu Chriſto ſervulus,

GEO. KENDALL.

TO

TO THE

REVEREND, DOCTOR Benjamin Whichcot;

PROVOST of *Kings-Colledge*,

AND LATE

VICECHANCELLOR

OF THE

UNIVERSITY of *CAMBRIDGE*;

TOGETHER

With the reſt of the Heads of COLLEDGES, and Students in Divinity, in that famous

UNIVERSITY.

May it pleaſe you,

I Once more adventure to addreſſe my ſelf to you, not without many humble thanks, for that your continued *patience* ſo freely allowes me to imploy my poor *pen* in that *Work*, which others, and thoſe no inconſiderable men, (taking the meaſure of *your* ſpirits by the height of *their own*,) did ſometimes think, you would have wholly engroſſed to *your ſelves*.

For albeit the *former* part of my Diſcourſe, had the luck to be engaged in a ſoure Argument,

Difficilem tenuit ſub inique judice cauſam,

Which it was your *wiſdome*, not to be too forward to meddle in, conſidering how untowardly it ſounds in all *unregenerate* ears, (ſuch as the *moſt* are like to be in the *beſt* age;) and might perhaps have unſeaſonably whetted ſome froward ſpirits, againſt your *learning* and *maintenance*; which they ſufficiently grudge you, notwithſtanding you meekly enough ſuffer them to enjoy, and vent themſelves without any importuner interpoſing to their diſturbance; yet *this point*, which by your favourable permiſſion, I am now to deal on, is of ſuch a *complexion*, as is as like to *take*, as the other was to *diſpleaſe*.

For howbeit the Doctrine which I here defend, be bold to deny, that *any Apoſtate continuing ſuch to the end, was ever a true Beleever from the beginning*, which may chance to *heat* ſome *ill blood*; yet it *cooles* all again with this ſeaſonable *Julip*, that *no man who was at any time a true Beleever, ſhall be alwayes an Apoſtate.*

And truly, this is the beſt comfort the Church hath left her in this Apoſtatical age, that there is place to conceive, that many of thoſe who are now too deep in the *bogges*, did once ſtand upon firme *ground*, and accordingly will not ſinke full down into the *bottomleſſe pit*, but be mercifully reſcued in due time by the hand of God, as deſperately as they plunge themſelves at preſent into the *depths of Satan*: That ſome of thoſe who now neglect, and deſpiſe thoſe *Ordinances*, wherein heretofore they may be thought to have placed all their chiefeſt joy, will one day ſee the unhappy *darkneſſe* of their New Light, and returne to the exerciſes of *devotion* with as much holy *ſorrow*, as now they go off from them with profane *ſcorne*: That ſome of thoſe who ſeem to diſgorge all the *ſincere milke of the Word*, which they heretofore ſucked as *honey*, will at laſt again as impatiently *long* for it, as now they ſqueamiſhly *loath* it: That ſome of thoſe great wits, which now forget *Paul*, they are ſo much enamoured on *Plato*, will in good time diſcover the ſorrie *ſhallowneſſe* of their *profound ſpeculati-*

culations; and as much as they have wandred after this Metaphyſical leader, know at laſt to *what ſhepherd*, and to *which Cote* to returne; ſhortly, that ſome of them, who have either oppoſed, or betrayed the *Doctrine* of the Church, will have at length ſo much *grace*, as to confeſſe their errors, though perhaps they may not attaine to ſuch a needleſſe proportion of *wit* as to be able to confute them. This is the greateſt conſolation, wherewith the Church ſupports her ſpirits, in their preſent drouping; that ſhe remembers from *whence* many of her children are *fallen*, and hopes *all* of them will not forget it, but be brought in an happy houre to a hearty repentance, and *do their firſt works*. She is ſadly ſenſible how fearful a plague, their preſent declining doth threaten; only ſhe deſpaires not, but that the lifting up of others hands, may help to bring them down on their knees; and that contrary to what their revoltings ſuggeſt, their *latter end* will be *better* then their *beginning*.

This being the ſweet import of that precious Truth, which I here humbly contend for; I hold my ſelf the more obliged to make a ſolemne recognition of your ſingular favour, in not preventing me in this part of my buſineſſe; but quietly ſuffering me to finiſh it, without the leaſt interruption. And ſo much the more, for that ſome Reverend heads, once no mean members of your learned Corporation, have ſometimes judged this task to be too heavy for one ſingle mans ſhoulders; and though they were not ſo friendly, as to eaſe me of any part of the Burthen; yet were they ſo courteous, as in my behalf to complaine of the weight of it.

But praiſe be unto him, who hath enabled me to undergo it alone; And indeed, he ſeemes to have hung this load, as he doth that of the *earth*, upon *nothing*. The Truth which I defend, ſtands entirely in *its own ſtrength*, and hath imployed *my weakneſſe*, only to ſhew it needs no *might of man* to ſupport it.

The calumnies, which have been caſt on the Doctrine of Perſeverance, cannot but bluſh themſelves to an ingenuous

Recantation, when they review the holy *feare and trembling*, wherewith the great aſſertors of it, have all along, both wrought out their own, and prayed for other mens ſalvation.

And albeit a certaine ἐάκος ἄγραφον, unworthily patcht on the ſleeve of your right Reverend *Davenant*, by a Printer to your Univerſity, have been bold to ſay, that this Doctrine, *Nullis unquam veteris Eccleſiæ Patribus probata fuit, ſed ab omni antiquitate ſemper rejecta*; yet the learned and holy lips of our great *Uſher*, have given me a commiſſion, to tell both him and the world to this purpoſe, that that ragge was fetcht but out of a half-lighted ſhop, where *Thomſon* (belike in one of his *wet nights*,) took up all his good ſtuffe. You are directed to the ſigne, by your worthy M^r. *Plaiſer*, Part 1. Chap. 3. and more plainly, yea, fully led to it by that goodly Author, who lately wrote the Hiſtory of the Conference at *Lambeth*, procured by your famous *Whitaker*: By the ſame token he tells us upon the matter, that this your great Doctor, was but his wives Diſciple; and that he calculated his *Determinations* in the *chaire*, according to the tenour of ſuch Preparatory Lectures, as her more learned Ladiſhip was pleaſed to read him within the curtaines. Thus have ſome riper wits learned to undervalue that grand ornament of your Schooles; of whom ſaith Biſhop *Hall*, (who was as competent a judge,) *Who ever ſaw him without reverence, or heard him without wonder?*

The man did well yet in this, that he publiſhed this choice Piece with *fur prædeſtinatus*; of which at preſent I ſhall ſay but this, that this Theologicall Scoggin might have adorned the frontiſpiece of his Book with the words of your ingenious *Ignoramus*:

Hunc buye *libellum*,
Atque tibi wittum *tibi* jeſtáque *plurima* ſellam.

But be it what it will, as for the *age* of this Doctrine, what need we be ſolicitous? I hope the *preſent* times, have had

the

the fortune to be ſo much wiſer then the *Ancient*, almoſt in every point, that they ſcorne to look on any Doctrine, or practiſe in Religion, but what is (if I may have leave to uſe my Idiom of *Cornwall*, before your Senate of *Cambridge*) *ſpack* and *ſpang new*. Mr. *Goodwin* knowes there is a *Terra incognita* in Theologie; and he is travelling every day, to diſcover a conſiderable part of it; and though I doubt he cares not much to put in at *New England*; yet it ſeemes by what he ſaith, in his Preface to his Book of Juſtification, he hath a great minde to viſit the remoteſt parts of *America*; I ſhall be content to wait upon him κατὰ πόδας, as farre as my little gander-ſhinnes can ſcamble after him.

I have in this worthleſſe diſcourſe, which I here humbly preſent to you, endeavoured to ſhew with how unanſwerable Logick, his rare Rhetorick is attended in the *firſt Chapter* of his *Digreſſion*; which undertakes to prove, that his ſad Doctrine of Apoſtaſie, is the moſt ſovereigne Antidote, againſt that paſſion of the heart, which the beſt Saints are ever and anon wont to be ſick of; belike the danger of their *falling*, is the chief comfort of their *ſtanding*. In the ſecond and third I have vindicated moſt of the Arguments, uſually produced by the aſſertors of Perſeverance, from the ſubtile exceptions of Mr. *Goodwin*; who contrary to his wont, hath in this particular ſaid ſo little that is *new*, that he hath nothing more then the old Remonſtrants alledged, nor altogether ſo much; nor vouchſafeth he to take notice of what hath been replied to many of his exceptions, by your learned Dr. *Ames*. I have been content, to allow him the honour of diſputing ſtrongly againſt ſome few weaker Arguments, which are much of the making with his own, ſuch as may ſatisfie themſelves with the ſtile of *phraſes* and *ſimiles*, and had better deſerved of the cauſe, had they never appeared for it in the quality of *proofes*.

In the fourth Chapter, I have cleared the ſenſe of ſundry Scriptures, which he had troubled with over-ſtirring in them; ſo do ſome boiſterous creatures do, whenever they would drinke of the *pureſt ſtreames*.

In the fifth I have anſwered his Arguments from Reaſon,

moſt of which are no other for the more material parts of them, then what ſome have ſaid, were ſufficiently maimed by my *former* Diſcourſe. Onely I muſt needs ſay, I meet here with ſome new ſtraines of Metaphyſical learning, which I ſhould never have had the happineſſe to have been acquainted with at *Oxford*; and I doubt they are but ſtrangers at *Cambridge*, the more reaſon you had to uſe them with all *civility*.

In the ſixth, I have briefly conſidered his eminent examples of Saints Apoſtatizing; but muſt needs ſay, he needed not have gone ſo farre back, as *Hymenæus*, and *Philetus*, *Solomon* and *David*; I know where he might have been furniſhed with farre better inſtances nearer home.

In the laſt, I have taken cogniſance, (at the importunity of friends, though againſt the ducture of my own *genius*,) of thoſe paſſages which he quotes, both out of the Ancients, (Grammercy *Voſſius*) and out of later Divines, even *Calvine*, poor inconſiderable ſelf-contradictor; and (who would have thought it?) *Piſcator*, whom he hath drawn in to him by ſome new *hooke* and *crooke*; yea, and *Parens*, on whoſe *cheeks* he hath fallen elſewhere; yet here he ſtroakes them ſo, as to make them look very friendly upon him: nay, and he hath brought whole Churches to make ſome *confeſſions* to him, queſtionleſſe out of fear;

Quibus hoc contingere templis,
Aut muris potuit, nullo trepidare tumultu,
Cæſareâ pulſante manu?

Throughout the whole, I have made it my work to ſhew that our Doctrine of Perſeverance, is not guilty of lulling the Saints in a ſecure neglect of their duty; but is a moſt happy encouragement to an holy performance of it. And that we may all faithfully diſcharge our ſeverall duties, in our reſpective ſtations; that we may comfortably labour here, in a confident expectation of reſting hereafter; that we may keep *faith*, *and a good conſcience*, though

though we loſe *all* things elſe, in the ſaving of *them*, is my daily prayer; and ſo I ſhut up this Epiſtle with a weighty paſſage, of your old Poet-Orator *Herbert*, a little inverted;

May prayers *chaſe* Syllogiſmes *into their den,*
And Ergo *be transform'd into* Amen.

It is the moſt hearty deſire, of

Reverend, and Right Worthy Sirs,

Bliſland *near* Bodmin *in* Cornwall. *Sept.* 3. 1653.

Your moſt humbly devoted Brother, and ſervant in CHRIST,

GEO. KENDALL.

THE STATIONER TO THE Reader.

Gentlemen,

Although you ſee the labours of our Reverend Author, have received a large Teſtimony from the chief Heads of the Vniverſity of Oxford; *and I finde by good experience, a general and grateful acceptance from thoſe that be godly and learned; yet having with importunity obtained a Copy of an eminent Atteſtation, by ſo Reverend a Name as this of Biſhop* Hall *the aged, (who under the ſame covert, did by the hand of his Son encourage our Author to another great Work, which will ere long, God willing, be diſpatched,) I am bold here to ſubjoyne it, humbly conceiving it may adde ſome luſtre to theſe precious truths which are maintained by this our Learned Author, (though they ſhine moſt clearly by their own light in the eyes of thoſe who are gracious;) And may help to take off the edge of thoſe inſolent ſpirits, whoſe wont of old it hath been to decry theſe truths of God as Calviniſtical and Puritanicall.*

SA. GELLIBRAND.

Worthy Mr. KENDALL.

I Cannot forbear, though with a ſick hand, to ſignifie my thankful receipt of your excellent Work; part whereof I had eagerly peruſed before this your welcome preſent came, and had deſired my Sonne to impart unto you my appreciative thoughts concerning it. I eaſily foreſee how highly you will be tempted with applauſes for ſo acceptable a ſervice; I know I need not, but my tender love of you bids me deſire you, with an humble heart to ſing *Non nobis Domine*, but let the whole praiſe run clear back to that infinite bounty, from whence theſe precious gifts came: And go on to improve thoſe great parts, to the further Honour of the Giver; With my thankful acceptance of your comfortable Letter, and rich preſent; I take leave, profeſſing my ſelf

Higham, March, 1652.

Your heartily devoted friend and Fellow-Labourer,

JOS. HALL, *B. N.*

TO THE READER.

I Moſt humbly crave his patience, whiles I hold him with a few words, in the *entrance*; ſuch (I conceive) as will be of ſome uſe to him in his *paſſage*, through moſt parts of my Book.

1. Concerning the *matter* of my Diſcourſe, I ſhall pray him to take notice, that though it all along aime at the *comfort of the Saints* in the *certainty of their ſalvation*; yet it hath not a word to ſay, but what may keep them as *low* in the *conſcience* of *their own ſins*, as it ſets them *high* in the *confidence* of *Gods goodneſſe*. It hath ever and anon imployed it ſelf in Anatomizing *the old man*, which, (wo is us!) is but too *lively* in the beſt *new Creature* under heaven. It hath made it much of its buſineſſe, to diſcover the *unregenerate part* in every *Regenerate ſoul*; yea, in every *part* of *her*; and this *unregenerate parts* unhappy interpoſings in *every part* of her *beſt performances*. It hath taken ſome paines to *aggravate* the *ſins* of the *Saints*; and it hopes without offence, to ſhew ſome *ſecret blemiſhes* in their *faireſt graces*. Nay more, it hath adventured to lay much of the *foundation* of their *comfort*, in the *ſenſe* of their *frailties*, having a warrant from God himſelf, who bidding his Prophet to comfort his people, *Iſa.* 40. *Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people*; wills him to crie firſt, and lowdeſt, *All fleſh is graſſe, and all the goodlineſſe thereof is as the flower of the field; the graſſe withereth, the flower fadeth; but the Word of our God ſhall ſtand for ever*, verſ. 6. Sure, if there be any goodlineſſe of the fleſh, better then other, it is *that* which is only *in*, not *from* the fleſh; and is called *goodlineſs of the fleſh*, becauſe *in it* as its ſubject, though not from it as *its cauſe*. As *Regeneration* is called *earthly*, John 3. becauſe wrought in men *on earth*, though by the power of *heaven*. But even *this* as it owes its *beginning*, ſo doth it its *continuance* to the *Spirit*; without which it would follow the fate of all other qualifications, yea, periſh *before them*. To this purpoſe my Diſcourſe hath plainly told the Saints, that their *corruptions* are ſtronger then their *graces*; and having had the *full* poſſeſſion of them at *firſt*, and holding *too much* to the *laſt*, would upon all occaſions, throw out thoſe troubleſome inmates, their *graces*, did not the *Spirit of God* vouchſafe them his own immediate aſſiſtance. It hath gone further, and ſhewed that without the continuall influence of the ſame Spirit, the greateſt

graces

graces, though not *baniſhed* by *corruptions*, would *vaniſh* of *themſelves*; as the *light* needs nothing to *extinguiſh* it, but the *withdrawing* of the *Sun*, or *taper* from whence it ſtreamed. So farre hath it been from letting ſlip any thing, that might give the leaſt whiſper of encouragement to the Saints, to *neglect* any of Gods *Ordinances*, or *deſpiſe* any of his *threatnings*; yea, or *their own wayes*.

It hath indeed ſhewed that the *Ordinances can* do *nothing* without the *Spirit*; but withall, that the *Spirit will* do *liitle* without the *Ordinances*. Shortly, it hath been ambitious to debaſe every other thing, that it might the better exalt the honour of *grace*; and it hath ſacrificed the honour of *grace* it ſelf, as it is χάρισμα, to the glory of the *Spirit of God*; to whom we owe not only the *gifts of grace*, but that we *have* the *poſſeſſion*, *make uſe* of them. It hath all along diſclaimed two falſe *ſuppoſitions*, which are the principall *foundations* of Mr. *Goodwins* learned *Digreſſion*.

The firſt, that our Doctrine aſſerts *the Saints are in no poſsibility of falling away finally, or totally*.

The ſecond, that *God hath decreed to ſave them, continue they never ſo looſe, and exhorbitant*.

As for the firſt, I have ſhewed an *impoſsibility of the Saints ſtanding* as of *themſelves*; only that though it be *impoſsible* they ſhould *ſtand*, as of *themſelves*, it is *impoſsible* they ſhould *fall finally*, or *totally*, in reſpect of the *purpoſe* of *God* to prevent it. Now ſuch an *impoſsibility* of our *ſtanding*, and *impoſsibility* of our *falling*, are ſufficiently conſiſtent.

Why may it not be with the *members* of Chriſts *myſtical* body, as it was with the *bones* of his *natural*? theſe might of *themſelves* have been *broken*, as well as thoſe of the *Malefactors*; *could not* be *broken*, as being preſerved by the *decree of God* to the *contrary*: What a wad of ſtraw was that *barre* of *iron*, that ſhould attempt to hurt them, being fenced by ſuch a *mountaine of braſſe*?

And the right conſideration of theſe two: The Saints *unability* to *ſtand* as of *themſelves*, the *impoſsibility* of their *falling* in regard of Gods *gracious ſupport*, happily keeps the ſoul in a pious poſture of *faith*, without leaning either to *preſumption* on the one hand, or *diſtruſt* on the other.

Firſt, To keep the Saints from *preſumption*, I have ſhewed that they are but *men at the beſt*, when the *beſt of men*; and cannot be preſerved by any *leſſe power*, then *that* of *God through faith to ſalvation*. He alone who *made Heaven*, can bring any *man on earth* thither. He alone who *made* Saints, can *keep* them ſuch. The Saints are in as *much* danger, if not *more*, then *other men*; their *faith* is as much, or more then any of their *own graces*. Whether we reſpect the *world*, the *Devil*, or *themſelves*.

For, 1. As for the *world*, though it be not altogether ſo *forward* to tempt the Saints with *preferments*, as being afraid to intruſt them with *ſo much power*, as might be dangerous to *its own intereſts*, if not managed according to its *deſires*, and *deſignes*; yet is it not *backward* to ſet upon them with all manner of *perſecutions*, whether of *tongue*, or *hand*; and to do its utmoſt to *conquer them* and their *faith*, whereby they have in good part *overcome it*. Now how would the poor Saints finde it an inſuperable difficulty,

culty, to ſtand *upright* under ſo *low a condition*, as the world ever and anon thruſts them into, were they upheld by leſſe then the *Almighty arme of God*. This alone helps them to *bear themſelves* up againſt whatever would *bear them down*; furniſhing them with a holy haughtineſſe, which makes them humbly *pride* themſelves in being *diſgraced*; ſadly *pleaſe* themſelves in being moleſted; and ſullenly reckon themſelves *gainers* by *loſing all* for their Saviour.

Had the Saints no more then the *ſpirits of men*, how could they brook to hear themſelves, who are the *ſalt* of the earth, ſcorned as the *dung* of it, and who are the moſt *precious*, deſpiſed, as the *vileſt* of men? How would they *renounce* their *godlineſſe*, rather then endure to be *reproached* for it, yea, and ſometimes by thoſe who are *truly godly*, often by thoſe who ſeem *the only godly ones? Verè regium eſt, bene facere, male audire. They* had need be ſomewhat more then *men*, who can brook to be reported *falſe*, for their very *faithfulneſſe*; *turn-coats* for their *conſtancy*; *betrayers* of the Church, for doing that which alone could *preſerve it*; *hollow* to their Governours, for their *ſounder zeal*; which would not allow them to *ruine* them by *flattering* them; and choſe to hazard their *favour*, to ſave their *honour*; ſhortly, *fools*, and no leſſe then *mad*, only for being *wiſer* then ſome of their *betters* (forſooth,) who having gotten the reputation of *Oracles of Policy*, carried themſelves as the *Parables of ſottiſhnes*, and ſhew'd they had even *wit enough* to *undo*, both their *maſters* and *themſelves*. The *eares* of the Saints, are perhaps more *tender* then *other* mens; and ſo many *hard words*, as they are ever and anon *beaten* with, would *ſtrike them dead*, did not *Gods Spirit* graciouſly hold up *theirs*.

It is an inſufferable injury to them to be *ſlaine*, as he ſaid, while they are yet *alive*, in that dear *part*, their *name*, in which they *live* after they are *dead*; to have their *names* which are *written in heaven*, unworthily *blotted* and *ſlurred* here on *earth*. They ſhew themſelves to be more then *themſelves*, and ſupported by no leſſe then *Gods Spirit dwelling in them*, as often as they *keep* their *conſcience*, to the *loſſe* of their *credit*. Should he *forbeare to preſerve them*, they would be *perſwaded* to *become worſe*, that they might be *ſaid* to be *better*.

And when now and then the *world* is content to *flatter* them with ſome ſubtile *applauſe*, how would they not be inſnared by that ſlie *temptation*, to accommodate themſelves to the *world* in ſome *leſſer evils*, that the *world* might be encouraged to *ſpeak the more good of them?* Certainly, did not God ſtand by to *prevent* it, as they are apt to be impatient when *their good is evill ſpoken of*; ſo would they not be averſe from *ſome evils*, which would be *well ſpoken of*. *Homines ſunt, nihil humani à ſe alienum putent.*

Any thing *leſſe* then an *Almighty power*, is too *weak* to preſerve them. There is not any thing in the *world* that could *defend* them from *it*, eſpecially their faith; which the *world* looks upon as a more Religious *fooliſhneſſe*. For albeit only the *Italians* call a *fool* a *good Chriſtian*, yet the greater part of the world thinks a *good Chriſtian* a *fool*; and ſtickes not to *call Jeſus himſelf accurſed*. The *world* accounts *his Doctrine* as fit only for *Utopia*, or *New Atlantis*. It cannot be perſwaded there is any tolerable *bleſſedneſſe* in being *poor in ſpirit*, which is directly contrary to the *worlds* magnified

Magnanimity, as being nothing elſe but a Genteeler compound, of more *gallant vices*; and a more noble mixture, of *braver* kindes of *wickedneſſe*.

The *world* ſmiles to hear of that ſad promiſe, that *the meek ſhall inherit the earth*, as finding by common experience, that *the meek* have much ado to *hold* any little *part* of it; but that by yielding a *foot*, they loſe an *acre*, till at laſt their *meekneſſe* be fairly *diſpoſſeſſed* of *all it hath*. So farre is it from being in a capacity to make eitheir *conqueſts*, or *purchaſes*.

The *loving of enemies*, is eſteemed much out of the way to *getting friends*; nor are they held *friends* by the *world*, by whom *nothing is gotten*, but ſome dry expreſſions of *fel low-feeling*, by unprofitable *teares*.

That ſorry *bleſſedneſſe of mourners*, is ſuch as the *world* doth ſeldome *envy*, and never *cares for*; and as little reaſon hath any one, as it is wont to conceive, to long for the *happineſſe* of being *perſecuted*; which if any man be covetous of, the *world* is on all occaſions, ready to *help him*, to as much of that courſe *bleſſedneſſe*, as his heart can deſire.

The *world* thinks nothing the more honourably of *Chriſt* himſelf, for that he *triumphed* on a *Croſſe*; and profeſſed he was *glorified*, when he was *crucified*. It is ready to commend any *true Believers*, to ſo troubleſome a *preferment*, without a bribe. Shortly, albeit now at laſt the *world* be in ſome places, for faſhions ſake, content to allow Chriſt *better words* then it was wont; yet every where he is generally as *ill thought* of as ever. The *converſations* of moſt men being ſo many *contradictions* to the *Doctrine of Chriſt*; and ſpeaking them to be ſo little of his *minde*, that they look on his *wiſdome* as a quiet kinde of *fooliſhneſſe*, commendable only for this, that thoſe *ſofter ſpirits*, that are they know not why, taken with it, are apt to *harme* none but *themſelves*; and *leaving* the things of the *world* to thoſe who know how to *improve* them *better*, dully content themſelves with patient expectation of thoſe of *another world*; which ſay the moſt, *much good may they do them, when they can get them.* The *world*, though it be in ſome places *modeſter*, then to *ſpit* in Chriſts *face*; yet is every where bold to *ſmile*, as it were *behinde his back*; and even when it pretends to *bow the knees*, it doth little leſſe then *point the finger* at *him*, and all thoſe wiſe men, who are perſwaded to *follow him*, *denying themſelves*, and *taking up their croſſe*, the proper Armes of ſo *honourable a Corporation.* Did not Chriſt himſelf, (whoſe *Spirit* is greater then that of the *world*,) ſtand by, and aſſiſt them, there is no Saint, but would follow the guiſe of the *world*, and judge it the onely *reaſonable ſervice* of *God*, to *look to themſelves*.

Had the Saints no other enemy then the *world*, they could not ſtand, had they any other then *God himſelf* to uphold them; every Saint hath in the *world*, a *world* of *enemies*.

But, 2. The *Devil*, the *god of the world*, is yet a *greater enemy* to them, then all the *world*; and that in regard of *themſelves*, *himſelf*, and *God*.

Firſt, As for *themſelves*, he hates them as *men*, more as *good men*; and the *more good* he obſerves *in them*, the *more evil* he intends *to them*. Their *graces* provoke his *malice*; this *Lyon* eſpecially aimes to devour theſe *Lambes*, as whom he accounts a ſweeter prey, then all the *dogs* or *ſwine* come athwart him. For,

Se-

Secondly, as for *himself*, he malignes them more especially.

1. As *having gotten out of his power*, under which he had them fast enough, ere they were wonderfully rescued by the *hand of God*. That they are *gotten loose* from him, makes him use the best of his *skill* and *industry* to *recover* them; he looks upon it as a *disparagement to him*, that such poore *weaklings* should be too *hard* for him, and *break* those *bonds*, wherewith he hoped he had irresistibly *bound them* to an eternal *slavery*.

2. As *endeavouring to get as many as they can out of his hands*: He knowes them to be not only *fugitives*, but *adversaries* to his power: as who would engage all they have in the *opposing* of that *Kingdome*, which he hath long since *usurped*, and hitherto *exercised*, in the *world*. They make it their work to *overthrow him*, and therefore he is sensible how much it concernes him to *assault them*. *Sua res agitur*, they cannot *stand* but *he* must *fall*. *The gates of hell*, must either *prevaile* against them, or *sinke* under them. And what a reproach is it, thinks he, for so *great a Prince* (as he held himself to be) of the *world*, to be dethroned by *those*, who were once his contemned *underlings* and *vassals*? nor is he ignorant, what an *honour* it is to his Highnesse, to have these *Rebels* humbly submit themselves; and having had experience both of *slavery* under him, and *liberty* in being Christs, to prefer a *bondage* under him, before a *freedome* in Christ. It makes for his *glory* to have them return with *shame* to their *old fetters*, and account themselves happier in *his chaines*, then in that *Crowne*, which God was pleased solemnly to *promise* them, but on such sorry *conditions*, as seemed to make it not *worth* their *acceptance*. If he may get those who went for Gods *best servants*, do the *worst* of *his drudgery*, he shall have *ground* enough, both to *vaunt* of *himself*, and to *triumph* over *God*.

3ly. And in this respect he puts all his strength to it, as knowing how much it will advance his *reputation*, if he may weare *Gods signets* and *jewels*, on his own *fingers*; get Gods *children*, *heires* and *co-heires with Christ*, to be his sworn *subjects* and *servants*. *This* he is not to learne, will leave an aspersion on God, either of *weaknesse*, as not *able* to preserve them, or *unfaithfulnesse*, as not *caring* to do it, notwithstanding so many *publick engagements*, or *changeablenesse* at least, as having *once intended* to bring them *all to heaven* and *since* upon better consideration seen more cause why they should be *left to hell*. The *devil* hath done *all his businesse*, if he can but *staine* the Majestie of God with a *suspicion* of *variablenesse*. If he be *variable* he is not *God*; and then who can claim that title so well as the *devil*? If God may not be *King*, none is so fit as the *devil*, as who will *employ* few in his *Court*, though but in the Scullery, or the black guard, but he will finde meanes to *reward them* with houses of other mens building, and Vineyards and Orchards of other mens planting, all sequestred upon pretended Delinquencies, to the use of his *Crown*, to be as frankly bestowed by him on his *better servants* and *greater favourites*. He is alwayes in, at his *Omnia tibi dabo*, Provided thou but *fall down* and *worship me*. The devil understands his own intereſt so well, that he will give *any thing in the world*, for the *weakest soule* that God hath *chosen out of it*. Nor doth it *repent* him of any *paines* he *takes*, in *taking* off men from *repenting*, and bringing them back from *Gods* service to *his owne*. In which respect the

Saints have no reaſon to flatter themſelves, with a fond conceit of any *poſſibility* of their *ſtanding*, ſave only by the *interpoſition* of the *Power of God.*

Eſpecially if thirdly, they ſeriouſly reflect on *themſelves*, who if they diſcern not their *own weakneſſe in themſelves*, may eaſily do it in *thoſe* whom they are wont to acknowledge farre their *ſuperiours in grace.* It is conſiderable that the moſt *eminent Saints* are upon record for moſt *ſhameful ſins.* God did not regiſter their ſins to *brand them*, but to *caution us*, that we ſhould all look with an holy jealouſie to *our own feet* in *their ſlidings*, and thoſe in that very *path*, wherein they had *walked* with the greateſt *honour.* The *beſt Saints* have that within themſelves, which would ſoon render them the *worſt of men*: Their *corruptions*, though they be *all ſubdued*, are *none* of them *extirpated*; and the more they are ſubdued the more they are *incenſed*; and if the *bridle* were *taken off*, would *break* out the more *fearfully*, the more *rigorouſly* they have been *reſtrained.* *Luſts* of all kinds would *act* the more *outragiouſly*, the more *violence* they have *ſuffered.* A *ſlave*, if he get *power*, is wont to *lord* it the moſt *imperiouſly*, as *acting* not only for the ſatisfaction of his *luſt*, but his *revenge.* The Saints muſt know they have, though *leſſe* corruption *rampant*, yet as *much* as any others *couchant*; and which if it could once get looſe from the *grace of God*, would ſoon flie in the *throat* of it, and do all the *deſpight* it could to his *holy Spirit.* They obſerve *water* that hath been *heated*, is afterwards the *colder*; the *oppoſitions of grace* ſet an *edge* on *corruption*, and if *grace* were *withdrawen*, it would ſhew it *gathered heart* where it *loſt ſtrength*; and the *leſſe* it *flamed out*, the *more* it *ſmothered within*; the leaſt *ſpark* left *alive*, as ſure there are too many in the moſt *mortified ſoule*, would be enough to ſet the *whole man* in a *combuſtion*; and as one ſayes well on another occaſion, How little ſoever the *ſpark* be, there would be, alas, how great a deal of matter round about apt to take *fire.* *Corruption*, having gotten the *upper hand*, would remember how it was *kept under*, and act the more impetuouſly to ſhew it ſelf *Conquerour*, and to prevent all dangers of being retrived by any after-endeavours of *grace*; ſo then the Saints *corruptions* when moſt *weakened*, are *ſtrong* enough to *undo* them, did not *God himſelf preſerve* them.

2. And albeit their *corruptions* were never ſo much outed, yet ſtill their *infirmities* continue; and theſe *infirmities* would be *potent* enough to *overthrow* them. A *weak grace* would ſoon give way to a *ſtrong temptation.*

3. Their very beſt *graces*, are ſuch as would be brought unawares to contribute to their fall. Not only *knowledge* would *puffe them up*, but even *humility* it ſelf; and they are apt to *think* too *highly* of themſelves, becauſe they carry themſelves *lowlily.* But however the *ſtrongeſt grace* cannot ſtand *alone*; no, not for one *minute*, but as we ſee it in the *ſpecies* in our *eye* or *glaſſe*, or the *light* in the *aire*; they depend chiefly on the *influence of the efficient*, not the *ſupportation* of the *ſubject.* To ſhew us this God in his wiſdom, hath left the *choiceſt Saints* to ſhew themſelves *but men*, in reſpect of their *failings* in thoſe *graces*, in which we are eſpecially to *imitate* them, and for which we can never enough *admire* them, How did *Moſes* the *meekeſt man on earth*, *ſpeak unadviſedly with his lips?* and *Job* the mirrour of patience, and that to ſuch a height, that ſome have thought him rather

ther an *emblematical* then real Saint, both *curſe the day of his birth*, and challenge the *Authour* of it, *filling his mouth* with *empty arguments* againſt the *equity of his Maker?* Theſe things all happened to *them* for *examples* to *us*, to convince us of the *impoſſibility* of our *ſtanding* of our *ſelves*, whereas theſe *Heroes* or miracles of grace, as much higher then we, as *Saul* was then the reſt of the people, lay ſo ſhamefully upon their *backs*, upon the withdrawing of *Gods hand*.

Secondly, that nothing leſſe then the very *Almighty hand of God*, is able to uphold the Saints, appears hence: that neither exhortations examples, promiſes, mercies, threatenings, corrections can do it alone wo is us, how *dully* do theſe work on us, longer then God *whets the edge* of them, and ſets it full into our ſpirits! as ſharp a *two-edged ſword* as the Word is, it cuts not but as by the *power of God to our ſalvation*. We may conclude it hence, that oft-times *ſharper* words do leſſe, and thoſe which we look on as *blunter*, do more; to ſhew it is not the *weapon*, but the *hand* that wields it muſt have the glory. The truth is, ſo great is the *deceitfulneſſe*, and ſo many are the *ſleights* of the *beſt hearts*, that they can cunningly either ward off, or decline any of theſe, and even by the interpoſing, as it were, of a little *paper*, turne the *edge* of them. How witty are we all to *befoole* our *ſelves?* how often have we heard that which moſt nearly *concerns* us, and gravely put it off as *inconſiderable?* it is not the beſt *naile*, driven by the beſt *Maſters of the Aſſembly*, can *prick* the heart, till *God knock* it in. There is *ſtone* enough in every *boſome*, to turne the *point* of it, till God pleaſe to *mollifie* it by his *Spirit*; without this, an exhortation may prove a *killing*, cannot be a *quickening* word. The ſame word is at one time but as a *flaſh of lightening*, at another as a *burning fire* in our breaſts. The nature of the *Word* is the ſame, Gods *breathing* makes the difference of its *operation*. This makes ſometimes, that the ſame Word moves us more from a perſon of *weaker* parts, when as it did leſſe from one of *ſtronger*; and a ſhort *Item* goes beyond a copious Oration. Do you think *David*, till *Nathan* came to him from the Lord, with his *Thou art the man*, heard nothing that was without a parable, a reprehenſion of his ſin? had he not heard of the ſixth Commandment once in twelve moneths? had he not heard of Gods judgement againſt adultery and murther? he had *heard* it without doubt, but without *feeling*. His *eares* had heard the Law of God many a time over, his *heart* never fell under the ſenſe of it till *now*. Now *God touched his heart*, and *his heart ſmote him*. No word but dies in the *eare*, unleſſe God lodge it in the *heart*; nor doth the heart *entertaine* it till God *open* it, as turning the *lock* with his own *Key*.

Hitherto, I have endeavoured to ſhew how we eſſay to take off the Saints from *preſuming on themſelves*, by holding forth not only a *poſſibility* of their *falling*, but an *impoſſibility* of their *ſtanding*, without the immediate *ſupportance* of leſſe then the *Power of God*; as that, which as it alone gave the *beginning*, ſo alone gives the *continuance* of grace. It is a *new creature*, and ſo owns its *preſervation* to the ſame *omnipotent hand*, whence it derived its *original*. I ſhall next repreſent how my Diſcourſe hath attempted to arme the Saints againſt *diſtruſt*, by holding forth, 1. A *ſufficiency* in the *Power of God*, to preſerve *their faith*; And 2. An *engagement* of God, to employ

employ his *all-ſufficient power* to this bleſſed *purpoſe*.

1. As for the *ſufficiency of Gods power*, it cannot be denied, without an apparent injury, to the confeſſed glory of his *Omnipotency*. There is nothing in *this work* that can be pretended to involve *contradiction*, and conſequently nothing that can render it *impoſſible in it ſelf*; and if not *impoſſible in it ſelf*, it is not of any *difficultie* to the *Almighty*. Nor indeed hath Maſter *Goodwin* the courage to take up the Bucklers againſt us, in *this particular*; but albeit there be much in his diſcourſe, that *inferres* an *impoſſibility of this work*, there is not one paſſage of it, as far as I remember, that undertakes to *maintain* it directly: well, if at any time his notions, as they uſe to word it in this age, ſhall chance to grow upon him, ſo as to make him ſo *hardy*, I doubt not but we ſhall be able to defend our ſelves, within ſome ſuch *fortifications* as theſe.

That it is not *difficulter* to *maintain faith* in the *Saints*, then it was at firſt to *plant* it in them; and if therewere not *ſo much corruption* in them as to *exclude faith*, there is not ſo much as to *eject it*, God employing his power to continue its poſſeſſion. He who could make them of *unbelievers* to become *believers*, may with leſſe ado keep them from becoming *unbelievers*, being once made *believers*. If their corruptions when they were *ſtronger*, could not hold out againſt *his working of faith*, much leſſe are they able, being now *weakened*, and that very conſiderably, to thruſt it out in *deſpight* of him.

How did at firſt the *Reaſon* ſwagger, the *Imaginations* buſtle, the *Affections* ſtorme, ere faith could get *admittance*? being entred, ſhe *captivates* and *calmes* them; and now it requires *leſſe power* to *keep*, then it did to *bring* them under her.

The *working of faith at firſt* was the *chiefeſt* part of *the work*. This being overcome, the remainder is more feaſible. That power of God which did the *greater*, cannot be denied to be ſufficient for the *leſſe*.

2. Now that he is pleaſed to employ his power to this purpoſe, the Apoſtle *Peter* doth to my weak apprehenſion ſtrongly aſſert in theſe words, *Who are kept by the power of God through faith to ſalvation*, 1 Pet. 1. 5. as wherein he ſhews, 1. The end, *ſalvation*. 2. The means, *faith*. 3. Gods keeping his Saints in the meanes to the end, *through faith to ſalvation*. 4. And laſtly, his uſing his *power*, in this keeping *by the power of God*. I cannot but acknowledge I am ſo much taken with Mr. *Goodwins* ingenious evaſion, that and it were to ſave my life, I can ſcarce hold from a ſimpering ſmile at it. Saith he, [The clear ſenſe and importance of the place is this, that men once begotten by God to a lively hope, have the greateſt ſecurity, which the infinite power of God can afford, that perſevering in faith, from whence this hope iſſueth unto the end, they ſhall be ſaved.] *Ch.* 10. *Sect.* 18. From what ſhall they be ſaved thus by this power of God, ſoſolemnly engaged after [they have perſevered in faith to the end?] belike from the power of the *devil*, who *after they have perſevered in faith to the end* lies in wait to catch their ſoules, in their paſſage from their bodies to *heaven*; and notwithſtanding their *having perſevered in faith to the end*, to carry them captive to *hell*. I ſee it was not for nought that the *bells* were chriſtened, to fright away the *foule fiend*, that the ſoules of thoſe, who had

per-

perſevered in faith to the end, might have the *clearer way to heaven*, and the Angels that carry them thither, not be troubled with too much conflicting with the devils lying in *Ambuſcado*, and ready to charge them upon any advantage in their *march*.

And ſurely it was not without ſome reaſon, (though I had never the luck to underſtand it till now,) that ſome body called the *Ringing of the Bells when men die*, the *laſt office of the Catholick Church* aſſiſting them, by a Steeple-Devotion, in their aſcending through theſe dangerous territories of *the Prince of the aire*. But I wonder ſtill, what thoughts ſome of my old neighbours in the Countrey had, of the ſoules *lingring* after their departure from their bodies, ſo as to ſtay *idling* in the *enemies countrey*, till *the bodies* were laid on the *Church-ſtile*, and there to come, and take their farewell of them, till the Reſurrection, with a *ſolemne kiſſe*. Enough of this.

I conceive few Readers will be of Mr. *Goodwins* judgement, that [all the import of this Text, is but this, that the Saints perſevering in faith to the end, ſhall be preſerved by the *power* of God] *viz.* from the Devil, who likely enough would wreſtle more for any *ſuch ſoule*, then *Moſes* his *body*. This Text carries no leſſe in it, then that *God imployeth his power to preſerve them from falling*, and *ſo to make them perſevere to the end*.

Nor is this to be wondered at, that the Father intereſſeth his power ſo farre, ſeeing Chriſt ſo ſolemnly prayed him, *To keep by his own Name thoſe whom he had given him**. His *Name* ſounds his *power*, and ſomewhat *more*; yea, and he prayed him further, *Not to take them out of the world, but to keep them from the evil*, ver. 15. queſtionleſſe by his *power*: Nay, Chriſt had *all power both in heaven and earth, put by the Father into his hands*; for this very purpoſe, *That he might give eternall life to as many as the Father had given him*, ver. 2. And when he aſcended, he ſent the Holy Ghoſt, which ſhould not only keep them by his *power*, but endue them with *ſo much power*, as to do *greater works then thoſe which Chriſt had done*, John 14. v. 12. *Joh. 17. 8, 11.

Shortly, if we conſider, that God the *Father* ordained his Elect to heaven from eternity; that he ſent his *Son* in the fulneſſe of time, laying a command upon him, *to loſe none of them*; that the Son ſent the *Spirit*, which was a gift of that nature; that the enjoying of it, not onely made amends for *his own departure*, but was above the benefit of his *bodily preſence*; we may well conclude, God would uſe his *power* to accompliſh this *work*, the *ſalvation of his people*, which, as I have ſhewed, could not be effected by *leſſe* then *his own Almightineſſe*. The Perſeverance of the Saints is of that weight, that we *can hang* it on no leſſe, then the *eternal counſel* of the *Father*, the *infinite merit* of the *Son*, the *effectual operation* of the *Holy Spirit*; and the *joynt concurrence* of all *three bleſſed Perſons* to effect it.

We know the *wills of men* to be *mutable*, we ſuſpend it on the *unchangeable Decree of God*; we acknowledge the *ſtrength* of *men* to be *feeble*, we ſuſpend it on the *power of God*, whereby he hath promiſed to prevent the *gates of hell* from *prevailing* againſt his Church, and conſequently to *preſerve his Church* till he bring them within the *Courts of Heaven*.

Thus do we not deny a *poſſibility of the Saints falling*, both *totally* and *finally*, as to *themſelves*; and yet affirme an *impoſſibility* of it in reſpect of

***

Gods

Gods *eternall decree*, imploying his *Almighty power* to preſerve them, which *alone* can do it.

As to the ſecond, I have ſhewed that Gods decree is to ſave them from continuing in ſuch looſeneſſe and exorbitancy, and that this looſeneſſe and exorbitancy is much the more odious to the Saints upon this account, for that though God have from all eternity *decreed their ſalvation*, that *decree* cannot take *effect* ſuch *exorbitancy continuing*. So long (ſay we) they are in an incapacity of finding either *glory* in *Heaven*, or *comfort* on *earth*. They muſt be *purged* ere they can be *ſaved*; let them have never ſo rich a *manſion prepared* for them, they may not look to *enter* into it, as long as they are *lepers*; *ſin* would for ever keep them out of *Heaven*, did not Chriſt take them off from their *ſin*. God (it is true) *juſtifies the ungodly*, but *all* thoſe whom he *juſtifies*, he *makes godly*; nor have any of them any *evidence* that they are *juſtified*, but this, that they are *ſanctified*.

Every *breach* in their *converſation*, is a *brack* in their *comfort*; they cannot look on God as *their God*, longer then they walk as *his people*. Whenever they *miſdemean themſelves*, they muſt expect to *heare from him*. He is ſuch a *Father*, as hath a *rod* for every *diſobedient childe*; and albeit he do not preſently *diſinherit* him, he failes not to *diſcountenance* him; he cannot turne away his *face*, but he troubles his *childrens hearts*, who muſt be ſure of *correction*, or they may be ſure they are *baſtards*. The more *good* he *intends* to them, the more *evil* he *inflicts* on them, many *temporal croſſes* to prepare them for *eternal glory*. He hath no *choſen veſſel*, but he throughly *ſcowres* it whenever it is *ſpotted*, nor hath it any *ſtaine*, but he hath *hot water* to fetch it out.

Every *ſin* drawes a *ſcourge* after it; albeit he *deſigne* men to *heaven*, yet many times he *deſtroyes* them on *earth*; ſometimes *blots out their names* here *below*, as much as they are *written* in indelible Characters *above*; yea, often leaves them to ſuffer in their *poſterity* in *this* world after they are crowned with *glory* in the *other*; and viſits the ſins of their *lives* after their death, on that *part* of them which *ſurvives* in their *iſſue*. So *terrible* is *God in his judgements*, even to thoſe who have *moſt* of his *mercy*.

And queſtionleſſe, the more *merciful* they have found him, the more *ſenſible* they are of his *diſpleaſure*. Of all corrections that ſeemes *harſheſt*, which comes *from a kinde hand*. The *glove* of a *Father*, ſeemes to ſmart more then the *rod* of a *School-maſter*; and though *this* only may draw *bloud*, that drawes more *teares* from an ingenuous childe. The Saints are much more troubled at the *frowne* of God, then wicked men are at his *vengeance*. They diſcover no anger in *his eye*, but they are diſtracted with indignation in *their own hearts*, and make a ſtrict inquiſition after the *ſin*, which incenſed *their father*. Alas, what comfort can they take in *all the world*, when they have *none in God*, but finde him for the time, as it were reſigning his Title of *the Father of mercies, and God of all conſolation?*

I cannot but admire, what it was that encouraged Mr. *Goodwin*, to this frontleſſe calumniation, that according to the tenor of our Doctrine: *the Saints may be ſaved, continue they never ſo looſe and exorbitant*. *We* ſay, and it is a wonder, if *he* do not know it, that during *any* wilful *exhorbitancies*, they

are

are no way qualified for *comfort* here; much leſſe for *Glory* hereafter.

The truth is, he is content to acknowledge *Chap. Sect. that we diſclaim that monſter of aſſertions*, which he is ſo often bold to father on us; onely forſooth, it is quoth he, *the genuine Conſequence of our Doctrine.* Wo were us, and our poor Doctrine, if it were guilty of all thoſe ſpurious *conſequences*, which his rude Logick is pleaſed to charge on it. But let him know, we dare meet him at any time at thoſe *fiſty cuffes.* And doubt not, but as we have many a good time, and often don, to beat him well enough with *his own hands.* I deſire the Readers patience to liſten a while, what *pretty work* the man makes, as *horrible a quoile* as he keeps about it. Marrie we teach in *terminis*, that *God hath decreed to preſerve his Saints from falling away totally and finally from their faith, and to keep them by his power, through faith to ſalvation*; Ergo, we teach by *conſequence*, that *they may be ſaved though they fall, and lie all along, without ever riſing againe.* We teach in *terminis, God hath decreed when they fall to recover them by repentance, and ſo to bring them to ſalvation*; Ergo we teach by *conſequence*, that *they ſhall be ſaved, though they continue never ſo long in ſinne without Repentance.*

Which is juſt as if I ſhould ſay, Mr. *Goodwin* ſaith in *terminis*, he uſeth to ride his Horſe with a bit, to pluck him up when he ſtumbleth, that he may come ſafe to his journies end; *Ergo* he ſaith by *conſequence*, he ſhall ride ſafe to his journies end, though he leave his Horſe in the middle of the way.

And ſurely his Horſe, though he lie all night tired in a ditch, in the middle of the way, may be ſaid to have carried him through to his journies end, by almoſt as much reaſon as he learnedly ſheweth how *the Horſes may be ſaid to have drawn a Cart out of the mire, though they leave it ſticking in the midſt of it*, Chap. 11. Sect. 23. Nothing is too hard for ſuch a Giant-like wit, which for a need can prove that if we ſay in *terminis*, (as we do,) *The Saints cannot be ſaved, unleſſe they repent*, Ergo we ſay by *conſequence*, they may be aſſuredly ſaved, *though they never bethink themſelues of repenting*, but obſtinately continue in whatever looſeneſſe, and exorbitancies.

Yet not to wrong him in *earneſt*, by being in *jeaſt*; His meaning is in all likelihood, that we aſſert ſome *other* thing in the maintenance of our doctrine, which drawes ſuch a *taile* after it, as gives it ſuch a croſſe flap in the *face*, but whatever he produceth to this purpoſe, will, I preſume, appear to the Reader to be at moſt but a *flap with his fox taile*, which I have ſufficiently turned off with my *Gooſe-feather.*

Theſe two, I know not whether I ſhould call them miſtakes, or ſlanders, have ſwelled Mr. *Goodwins* Digreſſion to ſo formidable a bulke; theſe being removed, all the Cargaſon of his *Iliades*, may be very conveniently lodged in a nut-ſhel, and a *Norimberg* flea, might carry this his Digreſſion about his neck without galling the skin. And yet as ſuppoſing this his Carrick had drawn too much water, to be able to come into every harbour, he in his wiſdom, thought fit to unload a conſiderable parcel of theſe precious commodities into a certain Shallop, called Ετερομαχια. The title ſhewes who

was ſole Maſter, though I know not how many Mates, that love to have an oare in other mens boats, put their hands to the lanching of her with the more ſolemnity.

The truth is, that men pretending to piety, ſhould ſo defame the doctrine of their brethren, is not a little to be marvelled at. But in the mean time the reputation of our doctrine is not at ſo great a loſſe, as that of their learning, which yet I confeſſe cannot be great, ſeeing they had ſo little to loſe.

And in this reſpect, it matters not what it pleaſeth their towne Logick report in this kinde, to which I hope being a chief part of *uncircumciſed humane learning*, they themſelves do not adventure to give too much credit.

The leſſe reaſon have I to be much moved, with either their *Rumor gentium*, or *ſtridor dentium*, as wherein they were pleaſed, it ſeemes, firſt to let fall ſomewhat, that might give occaſion to their well wiſhers in the Countrey, to report that Mr. *Goodwin*, having gotten my late Book, ſheet by ſheet from the Preſſe, had diſpatched an anſwer to it, with ſo much incredible celerity, that it was extant, within three or foure dayes after mine was got forth.

This Grollery not taking: They voted next, that it was below their *great Paſtor* belike, to take notice of ſuch a *ſilly ſheep*; and accordingly I had the happineſſe not to hear a word of him in his late Book on *Rom.* 9. as deſperatly as he falls on *one Mr.* Pawſon, *as the Preſſe nameth him*, and ſure neither need this *one Mr.* Pawſon, *as the Preſſe nameth him*, be offended at his language, ſeeing he quippes the late Lord Mayor, and the whole Court of Aldermen, with a *facultas Theologica*, and tells them in a Reverend jeere, that *if they pleaſe to make an order for it, he will be ready to anſwer the ſaid Sermon of the ſaid one Mr.* Pawſon, *as the Preſſe names him.* This one Maſter *Pawſon*, I doubt not is a man of as much note as Mr. *Goodwin* was, when he was in the Univerſity, if I be not too much miſinformed.

But he hath ſince gotten the ſtart of all men, and the leſſe cauſe have his Adverſaries to take it ill, that he ſupercilliouſly overlooks them as ſo many *poor ſnakes*, with *Cunarum labor eſt* angues *ſuperare meanum*. It is right like an *Hercules*, much good may he do with his *triumph*, as long as the Truth hath the *victory*. It hath not loſt much ground, by that mighty and puiſſant Piece of his, upon the 9th. Chapter of the Epiſtle to the *Romanes*, wherein he overthrows not any thing that hath been produced by our Divines, to prove that that Chapter aſſerts a perſonal Election and Reprobation, but only aſſerts his own conceit, that *the Apoſtle ſpeakes only of Juſtification by faith*, without taking notice, for ought I ſee, what hath been ſaid by them againſt it. He thinkes it enough to muſter up ſeven Arguments, which do all ſtand upon *this ground*, that *the Apoſtle there ſpeaks to the Iewes*, whereas we had thought he had ſpoken *to the Romans*, and only *of the Iewes*, not *to* them. He ſaith he would not be thought *to plow with* Arminius *his Heiffer*; truly I think he contented himſelf with *Ulyſſes his Puppies*; and accordingly he hath made the beſt of his *furrowes*, both in that, and this *ſand* we are now upon.

As for ſome taſte of his work, may it pleaſe the Reader to take notice of theſe pretty paſſages, which I ſhall here briefly mention.

1. Saith

1. Saith he, *The Doctrine of Apostasie is much more comfortable then that of perseverance.* Belike it is much more comfortable to a childe to *fall* from *his own foot*, then to be *upheld* by his *fathers hand*; and much more comfortable to Mr. *Goodwin*, to have his members be apt to *drop from him*, one after an other, then to have them sure to *stand by* him, and *for* him. Chap. 9. §. 2.

2. He is pleased to say, *Either of these three Doctrines is much more comfortable, then our Doctrine of Perseverance.* Ibid. §. 13.

(1.) *All men shall be saved without exception, whether they believe or no.*

(2.) *No man shall be punished for any sin whatsoever, either in this world or in that to come.*

(3.) *Men are as much approved of by God in the committing of the greatest sin, as in the performance of the greatest duty.* They who take comfort in any of these, can I grant take none in *our Doctrine of Perseverance*; nor is it fit *such swine* should have to do with *this pearle*.

3. *The main providential occasion, as he conceiveth, which caused this Doctrine of Perseverance to flourish hitherto like a green Bay-tree in this land, (as it hath done,) was the permission of Mr.* Perkins *his judgement to be over-ruled on this hand, &c.* Ibid. §. 25.

I may as wisely say, that Mr. *Goodwin* is as like to make it *wither*, and be of the same colour with a *brown Bay-Horse*.

4. *Our best translators of the Scripture*, (questionlesse Mr. *Perkins* his Scholars,) *stained their fidelity more then once, out of pure favour to this Doctrine of Perseverance.* The *staines* of their *Translation* are *fairer* then the *beauty* of Mr. *Goodwins Exposition*. Chap. 12. §. 3. & §. 19.

5. *Atheisme never perturbed States.* I would I could say as much of Mr. *Goodwins* Divinity. Chap. 9. §. 26.

6. *He should most love his friend*, (and so God) *if he would threaten him if he did not love him to become his sore enemie. The former* passage was a *collop* cut out of Sir *Francis Bacon*; *this* looks like a slice of *Veale*. I ear is a new unheard of provocation to love. Ibid. §. 18.

7. *Paul in saying*, Who shall separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord? *aimes but at this, that Christ intercedes for us; that what ever calamities we suffer for him, God would not disclaim us*, as being ashamed of us belike when we are for *his sake* persecuted, poor and naked, as possibly Mr. *Goodwine* may be apt to be of *his members*, if they should be driven to such straits for *his new Gospel*. Chap. 13. §. 32.

8. *The Elect are allied to* Paracelsus *his* non-Adami. Certainly Master *Goodwin* is descended both from *Adam* and *Eve* too. Chap. 11. §. 26.

9. *It is Sacrilegious to grant, that any persons of men and women are Elected from eternity.* Then are even *the greatest Patrons* of the Church guilty of that hainous crime, whereof they are wont to *accuse* Mr. *Goodwin*, and his dear clients, the *Sectarian Reformators*. Ibid.

10. *Regeneration is onely appropriable to persons living to years of discretion.* A sad speculation for the good Gentlewomen of *Coltmanstreet*; for none of their childrem that *die* in their *infancy*, can according to this ground be capable of *Heaven*; unlesse *unregenerate soules* may have the luck to *steal in*, contrary to Gods constant *Declarations*, and *manifesto's*. Yes, I cry mercy, Master *Goodwin shewes*. Chap. 13. §. 29.

Ibid. 11. *That all children are borne in a ſtate of favour with God:* And therefore no wonder though upon a ſerious conſideration of this new diſcovery, ſo many of his Church will not have their *children moleſted* with that *unneceſſary*, but *troubleſome* ceremony of *Baptiſme*; and diſcreetly deferre it till they come, as his pleaſant gibe is in his conſiderations about *water-dipping*, to their *Baptiſmal breeches, and boots*.

And yet, though *children be all borne in the favour of God*, *that* is not to be too much magnified, ſeeing

Chap. 13. §. 33. 12. *If there were any unchangeable love in God*, as we were wont to conceive, *aſſerted in Scriptures, or deduceable from them; it were a rational ground for any conſidering man to deny their authority, and that they are from God.*

Chap. 13. §. 27. 13. *The diſmembring of Chriſts body is no diſhonour to it:* And therefore the *rents* of Maſter *Goodwins Church* can be no *diſparagement* to its *beauty*.

Ibid. §. 31. 14. *The blotting of names out of the Book of Life, is no defacing to the Book:* Had Mr. *Goodwin blotted* out the *moſt of his Book*, he would have had the *fewer blots* on *his Name*; and ſuch *blotting* would have rendred it much *fairer* then all his *Writings* have done.

15. Onely, though he be not too happy in his *Proſe*, he deſerves the *Garland* for the *flowers* of his *Poetry*; witneſſe *theſe*, which may ſerve as a *noſegay* for any one of the proudeſt of all the *nine ſiſters*.

Chap. 18. §. 42.
What ere Neceſsity impoſeth,
The minde neceſsitated troubleth.

Ibid. §. 23.
The ſelf-ſame day wherein he ſinneth,
The perſon guilty himſelf condemneth.

Ded.
On him who ſits long at worke ſleep
Without diſparagement may creep.

Chap. 13. §. 19. Yet ſure Maſter *Goodwin* did not *over-ſleep* himſelf at *Parnaſſus*, nor did he over-drink himſelf at *Helicon*; But be it ſpoken without any mans envy, he is as ſober a Poet as ever drank ſheare *Thames*.

Eating, drinking, and ſleeping, are more rewardable then Perſeverance in Faith and Repentance, according to the common principles.

I may ſay of him, as old Doctor *Reynolds* did of *Petrus Comeſtor*, *Si non melior Comeſtor fuiſſet, quam Scriptor, certè fame periiſſet, adeò jejuna ſunt penè omnia.*

Chap. 19. §. 13. 16. But though he be not altogether the beſt at the Poetical part; yet without doubt, he is matchleſſe at the Hiſtorical; witneſſe his rendring *Goteſchalcus* as an Heretick, and juſtly condemned as ſuch; notwithſtanding the great Arch-Biſhop of *Armagh* abuſed the world, in ſhewing he was *purus putus Auguſtinianus*; but Mr. *Goodwin* thought it below him, to take notice of ſo inconſiderable a trifle, as his Hiſtory of *Goteſchalcus*.

Alas

Alas he hath turned over more Records of Antiquity, and the Reader may judge of his *Harveſt*, by his *gleanings* in this Book, which are no leſſe then

Criſpini ſcrinia lippi.

But in the mean time, that which made him diſdaine, to think on the Arch-Biſhops Hiſtory of *Goteſchalcus*, was this; that there are found in it ſeveral teſtimonies of both Fathers and School-men, for this Doctrine of Perſeverance, *pag.* 188. This it may be, made Mr. *Goodwin* as loath to touch this Hiſtory of *Goteſchalcus*, as *Goteſchalcus* was ready to put himſelf on that triall, which they called *fire Ordeal*, for the truth of his Doctrine, diametrally oppoſite to Mr. *Goodwins* bumbaſted out with ſo many ſhreeds of Antiquity, as would ſerve to fill up a Taylors *Hell*, though they weigh not ſo much as a Taylors *Gooſe*.

And he who ſhall caſt his eye on the Catalogue of Popiſh Writers, which I produce, and do no more for our Doctrine out of *Gerhard*, that famous *Lutheran*, will ſee at how *cheap a rate* a man may quote Authors by whole *legions*, and yet not be guilty of having read any one of their *paſſages*, which I am ſure I was not, though *one houre* more (had the weather but favoured me,) would have ſufficiently acquainted me with them all at *Sion-College*.

17. Mr. *Goodwin* ſees *the intereſt of an Oath working in the Synod of* Dort, *as it did with* Herod; *when for his Oaths ſake, contrary to his conſcience, he commanded* John Baptiſts *head to be given to a Damſel in a charger*. I ſhall name no more, for *this* very *paſſage* is enough to excuſe me, for whatever ſtraine of *courſer language* is to be found throughout my *Diſpute*. Maſter *Goodwin* may very well thank *himſelf*, for all he receives from me in *this coine*. Chap. 13. §. 24.

——— Si quid
Intumuit pietas, ſi quid flagrantius actum eſt.

Nor yet am I conſcious to my ſelf, of paying him any conſiderable part of what I owe him in *this kinde*; but if he have a minde to it, he ſhall hereafter have *his due to a doite*.

For the preſent, I am for the moſt part rather *merry* then *angry*; Nor do I know, why any ſhould grudge me my *pleaſantneſſe* in this work; ſeeing that commonly the Reader will finde a good ſolid argument under thoſe jocular expreſſions: beſides Maſter *Goodwins* Diſcourſe is ſo *ſowre*, that it needed ſomewhat to *ſweeten* it to the Examiner. And I may be bold to ſay, ſome of his Arguments are of ſuch a making, that too *ſerious* an anſwer, would have been meerly *ridiculous*. And though in the managing of this Diſpute, *I* have ever and anon ſeemed to forget my native ſullenneſs, yet *I* did it upon the advice of no unwiſer man then *Solomon*, Prov. 26. 5. conſidering how Maſter *Goodwin* hath braved it out in his Fuſtian; it was very convenient, *I* ſhould now and then ſuit my anſwer in the ſame ſtuffe, Alamode.

I look upon my ſelf now, as in the *Schooles*, not in the *Church*; and it is one thing to *diſpute*, another to *preach*; why any man ſhould be offended, for my not being *grave* in anſwering a *light* Argument, and my returning *quid pro quo*, *I* confeſſe *I* am to ſeek: I know not why I ſhould write a *confutation* of *anothers errours* in the ſame ſtile that I would draw up a *confeſſion* of *mine own faults*; *I* muſt lay aſide my *reaſon*, ere I can be in a capacity *not to* laugh at many a reverend abſurditie, which I meet with at every turne in Mr. *Goodwins* Diſcourſe; though I ſometimes *ſneere*, I never *ſnarle*, much leſſe do I *bite*.

Well, *jacta eſt alea*, and I am now at the mercy of the Reader; ſo God may have the glory of his grace, and his people the comfort of his promiſes, be *my portion* what it will in *this* world. I have given my ſelf a faire *quietus eſt* from other employments, that I might the more freely intend the proſecution of *this one* buſineſſe, which I look upon as one of the chiefeſt ends of my being; nor do *I* deſire to live longer, then I may ſerve God, and his Church, in this kinde of work. My good old Father was wont to pleaſe himſelf with an odde Motto; *De ſtraminibus non curat invidia.*

I ſay for my part; *I care not a ſtraw for envy*, as who am as much above it for my *ſpirit*, as I am below it for my *fortune*: And had I been of another temper, I had not engaged in ſo many invidious buſineſſes in the cauſe of God, as I have done within a few years. I profeſſe to take a pride in drawing upon me the malice of profane men, and binde on all their witleſſe calumnies, as ſo many *ſcarfes of honour*.

Nulla malorum
O Virgo nova mî facies, inopinave ſurgit.

The encouragement I have received from better men, makes me ſwallow up all with delight.

I am ſorry for nothing ſo much, as that I am enforced to engage upon the by againſt a man whom I very much reſpect, for moſt of his *Devotional Writings*, Mr. *Baxter*; but the truth is, he ſtands ſo full in my way, that I cannot paſſe on without a friendly ſcuffle with him: For that he aſſerts ſome ſuch curious novelties, as if they *ſtand*, all the good old Doctrine which I endeavour to defend, muſt of neceſſity *fall*. If there may be *new immanent acts in God*, which cannot be, but either in his *underſtanding*, or his *will*, my buſineſſe both in my former, and alſo in this Book, is utterly loſt.

So much doth it concerne me to make good the *impoſsibility* of it; and had Maſter *Baxters* new Diſcourſe to the contrary, (at the whole ſtuffe whereof I gueſſe by a ſmall ſhred of it in his Book againſt Mr. *Eyre*, been pleaſed to have come forth as ſoon as it intended, (though he talkes as if it were extant already) I ſhould have forced my ſelf to have returned an anſwer to it at the end of this Piece.

And

And in the mean time, 1. I muſt needs commend him, in that he artificially claps a certain groſſe conceit upon me, ſo that ſome Readers may be apt enough to think I own it; whereas I onely preſſe him with ſomewhat like it as an unhappy conſequence of his ſubtile notions. For at this rate do I chooſe to ſpeak, albeit my good Brother *Baxter* have learned another *Idiom* at the *Schola illuſtris* of *Kederminſter*.

However, I muſt needs ſay, that *groſs conceit of mine* is exceedingly beholding to him, farre above the proportion of its deſerts, for that he dignifieth it ſo farre as to ſay, it is the very *ſoul* of anothers Diſcourſe, *by which the Reader may ſee how brutiſhly it is animated.* Truly it was a good while ere my *poor ſoule* could hope to give life to any book of *mine own*; elſe I had not been full fourty years old, before I was prevail'd with to be a *fool in Print*, conſidering how many bundles of paper I have ſcribled in my time, by the ſame token one of my old neighbours ſaid, I ſpent every week as much in paper and Diurnals, (the choiceſt pieces of learning that place could accommodate me with,) as might have kept my houſe: and how much I have been preſſed to preſent that to the eye of the world, which I thought might well enough content it ſelf to die in the *darke*. Had my ſoul thought ſo well of her ability for *animating Books*, ſhe might have ſent before this time, whole ſwarmes of ſuch flies to buzze my infirmities and preſumptions in the eares of the Nation, and publiſhed a Sermon, a Sermon, a Sermon, and as many, &c. as *Democritus Junior*.

But that at laſt a ſingle *haire* of the Body of *my Book*, ſhould become the *ſoul* of anothers, is as farre beyond my *apprehenſion*, as ever it was above my *ambition*; for if it did *animate* it, though but *brutiſhly*, it had ſome *ſenſe* to ſpare it, which is as much as I can diſcerne in whole heaps of ſome greater Doctors *new Reaſons* againſt the ancient Doctrine.

Yet ſure this groſſe notion, is but ſuch a *ſoule* as is far from being *tota in toto*, or *tota*, I ſay not, *in qualibet parte*, but in *any one*. But be that Diſcourſe *animated* by what *ſoul* it will, I am ſure I have been *animated*, by very *intelligent ſpirits*, to fall upon the *Body* of Mr. *Baxters* Book, only one deſired me *to deale gently with the young man for his ſake*; and indeed Mr. *Crandon* hath handled him ſo unmercifully, that it is pitty he ſhould be baſted again, till he be a little recovered of his *aches*. That ridiculous monſter, as he calls that Book, was as *Perillus* his Bull, which made him roar emphatically, and cry for very anger, that he would in all haſte publiſh a *new ſix-penny Creed*, whereas we may have two whole mattins books at the price, and in each of them no leſſe then *three Creeds*, I hope all as *ſound*, though not ſo *full* as Maſter *Baxters* ſix-penny one. A confeſſion of our *errors*, will give more ſatisfaction, then a confeſſion of our *faith*; a confeſſion of Maſter *Baxters* own faith, is no confutation of anothers Book.

I ſhall adde only this, that Maſter *Baxters* clamor is rather as *Bell-rope* to make this Book ring ſo much the more, then a halter to ſtrangle it.

But, 2. He chargeth me with accuſing him of ſlighting Dr. *Twiſſe*; whereas, ſaith he, [*What is my language, why, I call him that moſt excellent,*

famous Divine,] and ſo will I acknowledge Maſter *Baxter*, and then I hope he will not charge me with ſlighting him, whatever elſe I ſhall ſay of him.

The truth is, he ſpeaks as honourably of Dr. *Twiſſe*, as he doth of my Reverend friend, Dr. *Owen*; to whom he according to his extraordinary modeſty, humbly acknowledgeth himſelf *inferiour in wit, and learning*; but withall addes, he could *as eaſily anſwer his Book, as write ſo much paper as the Anſwer would take up*; which doubtleſſe would deſerve a faire ſeal, and a *black-box* with *a lock and key*, to preſerve ſo precious a monument of his extemporary vein.

According to this rate of honour, which Mr. *Baxter* beſtowes on the late Moderator of the Aſſembly at *Weſtminſter*, and the preſent Vice-chancellor of the Univerſity of *Oxford*; I ſhould ſhew my ſelf a great reverencer of Mr. *Baxter*, in caſe I ſhould firſt acknowledge him, as I ſeriouſly do, a man of *eminent parts*, and I believe as conſciencious, and then adde that Dr. *Moulin*, (who is condemned to ſit in the ſame ſtocks with my ſelf,) cannot ſo well deſerve of the Church by any anſwer he ſhall make to Mr. *Baxters* Books, as he ſhall in being pleaſed to keep himſelf within the line of his own profeſſion, and preſenting his beſt skill to Mr. *Baxter* in a rare doſe of pills, which may purge out that malignant humour, myſteriouſly working in him, threatening to deprive the Church ere long, of ſo great an Author, and to make this glorious *new light*, ſuddainly to go out in a *ſnuffe*. This upon Mr. *Baxters* grounds, would be no ſlighting him. Surely no more then he may be ſaid to ſlight *preaching* and *confeſsing of ſinnes*, which he acknowledgeth neceſſary duties, but rather for the *week-dayes* then the *Lords-day*; wherein he conceives, too much time is uſually ſpent in theſe exerciſes; whereas the *moſt* ſhould be ſpent in *ſinging Hymnes to*
Direct. p. 532 *our Redeemer*. I had thought *confeſsion of our ſins in prayer*, and *urging confeſſion* of them in *preaching*, had been the chief way of *praiſing our Redeemer*, and would have been as well accepted as *ſinging*, though in the accurateſt way, both for the *Ditty* and *Song* even when the *London-Miniſters* have complied with Mr. *Baxters* deſire upon the place, in making a new tranſlation of the Pſalmes, a Work whereof Mr. *Goodwin* for his rare skill in Hymnifying Poetry, ſhall have my vote to be *Superviſor*.

Too much of this; I do not doubt, but with eaſe ſufficient, and time enough to make good my Poſition, as to the *maine*, albeit likely enough there may be ſome *punctilio's* in it, which I may not think worth the charge of maintaining. And I am bold to ſay I ſhall have this advantage above moſt Adverſaries, I ſhall at any time deal with, that I have learned to confeſſe an error; I hold it no diſparagement to the *Truth*, to ſhake off any ſuch hang-by *falſhoods*, as like ſome old *ſerving-man*, would ſeem to *greaten* its *traine*, but withall *detract* proportionably from its *credit*, and coſt it more to *keep them*, then all the ſervice they could do were they *true* and *faithful*, would ever amount to. And yet withal, ſome paſſages that have but a *courſe, thin look*, ſuch, as we ſay, *doth not honour the houſe-keeping*, being better examined, will be found to be very *honeſt* and *ſerviceable fellowes*; and ſuch as are every one of more uſe, then halfe a dozen ſaucy *Butterflies*, who are commendable only for *this*, that they preſerve the reputation of the drink, as charily keeping it from growing ſower.

I am no leſſe neceſſitated to cope a little with Mr. *Baxter* about what he aſſerts, of *the graces in the Saints not being ſpecifically diſtinct from what is found in meer natural men*, who have, ſaith he, *a weak power to ſpiritual good*, albeit the Apoſtle ſaith, that they are *ſtarke dead* in treſpaſſes and ſins, and they *cannot as much as receive it*, and which is more, that the beſt part of natural man, his *wiſdome* is *enmity againſt God*.

It concerned me to ſhew that the *graces in the Saints* are of *a diſtinct kinde* from thoſe Zanies of them which are found in ſuch creatures, as at laſt prove *true Apoſtates*, having been all along but *counterfeit Saints*.

I am ſorry that I ſhould be put at any time to meddle more then is needfull with Metaphyſical ſubtilties; and I could wiſh, that inſtead of diſcourſing of *ſpecifications*, *inſtrumentalitie*, the *termes* of actions, and their *ſubjects*; I might ſpend the remainder of my life, in diſcovering the corruptions of natural men when at *higheſt*, the goodneſſe of God to his Saints when at *loweſt*; in preſſing the great *duties* God requires, and the fearful *danger* of neglecting them; in contemplating the gracious promiſes of God, and his faithfulneſſe in performing them; in ſtudying how to keep downe the fleſh, and raiſe up our ſpirits. *Theſe* things are *good, and profitable to men*; the others make us nothing the more *holy*, and but little the more *wiſe*; but as the caſe ſtands, it's ſometimes *neceſſary*, to intermeddle a little in thoſe *unneceſſary* trivialities. It is more offenſive to me, that Mr. *Baxter* hath caſt out ſomewhat againſt the maine Doctrine of the Perſeverance of the Saints, in his late Directions for keeping peace of Conſcience; and that notwithſtanding his Apologie he ſullies it with ſeveral new Arguments, as he is pleaſed to conceive.

The firſt is, *That all the Lutherans are againſt it*; but of this I have ſpoken enough in my anſwer to Mr. *Goodwin*, boaſting after his wont of their joynt atteſtation (to take no notice of others) in the point. The man, as I have ſhewed, is miſtaken; and yet were he right, thoſe *Pſeudo-Lutherani*, as the Learned *Prideaux* calls them, (whoſe Reading is the greateſt piece of this Argument) are ſuch, as if I be not miſinformed, are at ſo deadly a feud againſt *Calvin* and *Beza* in other points, wherein I truſt Mr. *Goodwin* doth not agree with them, that they uſe (if I may ſpeak it with reverence) to Chriſten their Curres by their bleſſed names. We had need of much charity to call that man a Saint, who calls his Dog, *Calvin*, or *Beza*. They were each of them ſuch glorious lights in the Church of Chriſt; that though they might have ſome ſpots, ſo hath the Moon, yet their very *darkneſſe*, is better then all our beſt *new light*. *Apol.*

As for *Calvin*, I never heard any *good man* ſpeak of him without honour. Our great Mr. *Hooker*, though his mightieſt Adverſary, yet is fain to confeſſe him, *the wiſeſt man that ever the Church of* France *bred*; and he addes ſomewhat to this purpoſe, *that he was little beholding to any of thoſe that went before him, and a great glory to all thoſe that followed him*. Reverend Biſhop *Hall*, (who is I truſt no ordinary Judge of Eloquence) was pleaſed to tell me while I was a young Maſter of Arts, and at that time a great admirer of *Calvine*, for his very Rhetorick, that *Quintilians Inſtitutions*, were not better penned then *Calvins*. And whatever was ſaid of him as for *Calvins*

integrity, surely his *Inventory* when he died, which amounted to but little more then some of ours, is like to do about 40. pounds sterling, Books and all, shewes him to have been as right Reverend a Father in God, as the Minister of the Diocesse of *Lincoln*, *alias* Bishop *Williams*, who reports this of him in a lordly jeere. Doctor *Prideaux* was wont to say, it was a reproach to a Bishop *to die rich*; and therefore I conclude a glory to *die poore*.

As for *Beza*, though I will not undertake to justifie him in all his gibes, (they shall rather help to justifie me,) yet without all peradventure, we may call him *Bezaliel*, with as much truth as *Tilenus* doth in scorne.

Maxima mundi
Lumina sape suum, Bezam, *agnovêre Magistrum*.

Alas, what are the notes of *Heinsius*, yea, or *Grotius* to his? and yet I envy not *Grotius* that character, which an honourable person bestowed on him.

Our ages wonder, *by thy* birth *the* fame
Of Belgia, *by thy* banishment *the shame*.

Beza (as much as some would cloud him,) very well deserved that Epitaph which his great Scholar *Chamier* was pleased to make on him, taking his hint from an Eclipse of the Sun, the same day that *Beza* died; and it is appliable to all the Saints of God, in respect of their interest in his favour, and by it in the graces of his Spirit, according to the tenor of the Doctrine defended by me upon the place.

Defecêre simul, Beza, *&* *sol*, *Lumina mundi*,
Lumina sed constant, *sol sibi*, Beza *sibi*.

I Fnglish it thus,

The *Sunne* the *Worlds*, Beza *the* Churches *light*,
Were both *in* one *sad* day Eclips'd *together*;
All *will be wrapt in an eternal* night,
Ere ought *be able to* extinguish either.
The Church *did* Beza, *the* World *the* Sun *misse*,
The Sun *still kept* its *light*, *and* Beza his.

But as *honourable* an opinion as I have of *Calvin* and *Beza*, I have so *charitable* an opinion of their *Pseudo-Lutheran* Adversaries, as let them call both them and us all what they please, I shall hope Christ will not be ashamed to call us all *Brethren*, and not disdaine to keep multitudes of them, so as to enjoy that priviledge of Perseverance, which they inconsiderately oppose. I remember how violently even *Luther* expressed himself against *Calvin*; how meekly, and sweetly, *Calvin* answered *Luther*. I honour them

them both from my heart, they both concurred with us in this dear particular, wherein saith Dr. *Prideaux*, those same *Pseudo-Lutherani, turpissime à praeceptore suo deficiunt.* So that we have our Doctor, who is alledged by Mr. *Goodwin* to prove the *Lutherans* are all *against* us, affirming that *Luther* himself is *for* us; and that these *Pseudo-Lutherani* do not more rise against *us* their poor *Brethren*, then they fall from *him* their *great Master*, as to this point. And truly *Piscator* hath gathered enough out of one little book of *Luthers*, *De servo arbitrio*, (and how much more might have been collected out of all his great Volumes?) to assure us, that we have *Luther* voting with us in most of the points, which are allied to that before us; and that *Calvin* himself speaks not more to our purpose. Shortly, I profess again, to respect the *Lutherans*, to honour *Luther*, but the truth more, & yet seldome more then in *Luthers* Writings, which in several particulars, I shall shortly vindicate in an answer to that old profane Latine Pamphlet, lately printed in *London*, *Fur praedestinatus*, which I have now in the stockes. *Luther* was a *Swan*, as in his Name, so in his Writings.

Sic ubi fata vocant, udis abjectus in herbis,
Ad vada Maandri concinit albus olor.

All the *Eagles* about the Capitol, were *Geese* to this *Swan*; their gaglings could not deliver it from the *quil* of this *German Swan*, though they did from the *Talons* of the *Gaulish vultures.*

I can never forget that quaint Latine Epigram of *Beza*, which I shall here render in my course English.

The World *did stoop to* Rome, Rome *to the Pope*,
She *rul'd the* World *by* force *and* might;
He *ore-rul'd her by* fraud *and* slight,
Luthers *bare* quill *put* both *to* flight.
Vaine Greece, *to scare us with thy tales don't hope*,
Thy Gyants, baby Pigmies are;
Our Luthers quill *did more by farre*,
Then Hercules *his iron* barre.
There's no such Hero in thy Horoscope.

2. Master *Baxters* next shurre is drawn from the many *doublings, which are found ever and anon in the most of those who are so confident of the truth of this Doctrine of Perseverance*, that as much as they *seem to be one day in Heaven, they are next day as it were at the Gates of Hell.* The *uncertainty* of their salvation, seemes to him to infringe beyond contradiction, the over-*certainty* of this their Doctrine of Perseverance; and though he himself assert it *in terminis*, yet he looks on it as a point of no great evidence. *Apol. & Direct. p. 152, 231.*

To this I must needs say, that I believe his *allegation* is true, but the *conclusion* unanswerable. It is like enough none are more troubled with such aguish fits in their spirits, then those who are most zealous for this our Doctrine.

But, 1. This that the Saints are not alwayes certaine they shall persevere,

proves not that the Saints have not alwayes ground enough to conclude that they ſhall not certainly perſevere; we are now ſpeaking of the certainty of their Perſeverance, as in reſpect of *Gods decree*, not of the certainty of it, as in reſpect of the *Saints knowledge*.

The point *de certitudine objecti* is one, that *de certitudine ſubjecti* is another; it is true, the latter *certitudo ſubjecti* doth of neceſſity ſuppoſe *certitudinem objecti*; the former *certitudo objecti* doth not ſo evidently inferre the latter *certitudinem ſubjecti*; this then is *extra oleas*.

2. The Saints *have* alwayes *ſufficient ground* for this *certitudo ſubjecti*, though they do not alwayes *ſee* on *what ground* they ſtand. They *have* alwayes *reaſon* enough to be aſſured of their ſalvation, though they have not alwayes the happineſſe to *ſee that reaſon*. Even when they are at the *Gates of Hell*, they have cauſe enough to perſwade themſelves *the gates of hell ſhall not prevaile againſt them*.

3. What if God keep them from the *gates of Hell*, by bringing them *thither*, and thereby convince them how *little they can ſtand as of themſelves*, that they may with the more humility *caſt themſelves on him?*

4. This very *objection*, is a ſufficient *anſwer* to that lewd calumny, which is wont to be caſt on this our Doctrine, that it renders men ſecure, and preſumptuous, the common place wherein our Adverſaries are wont to diſplay their ſtrength in its greateſt bravery. Thus hath our Doctrine gotten a teſtimony out of the mouth of *contradiction*, which hath but *waſht* its face by *ſpitting on it*; and unawares *cleanſed* it by endeavouring to *foule it*, taking off a *blot*, by throwing *dirt* on it.

Direct. pag. 166. But ſtill I wonder what in all the world Mr. *Baxter* meanes, by ſaying to this purpoſe that he may have ground to be ſure of a mans *Juſtification*, yet not of his *Election*; *Juſtification* is a *fruit* of *Election*, and if he underſtand *ſuch a Juſtification*, as Mr. *Ball* calls *in a ſort, that Juſtification* is no more *Juſtification*, then Apoſtates *Reformation* is *Sanctification*, it is a ſhadow without ſubſtance. God never *juſtifies any*, but whom he *hath Elected*; he hath *Elected none*, but he will ſurely *glorifie them*, unleſſe Mr. *Baxter* can prove a *new willing in God*, which if it were poſſible, wo were us, *every mans ſalvation* were altogether *uncertaine*; what cauſe (alas!) have we all given God (could he will a *new*,) to will what is *contrary* to what he willed from *eternity*, in order to our *ſalvation?* our comfort lies in this, *he over-rules our wills*, *cannot admit an innovation in his own*.

A third thing which Mr. *Baxter* caſts out againſt this Doctrine, is this, that it is not ſo neceſſary, as we pretend, for the comfort of the Saints; but that there may much ſpirituall comfort, and peace of conſcience, be enjoyed without any *certainty of ſalvation*, upon ſome *probabilities* which he had formerly mentioned; And he undertakes to prove it thus.

Direct. pag. 174. 1. *No doubt* (ſaith he) *but* Adam *in innocency had peace of conſcience, and comfort, and communion with God, and yet he had no aſſurance of ſalvation*, i.e. *either of continuing in Paradiſe, or being tranſlated to glory*. What then? *Ergo* may any of us? I grant we might, were we *as innocent* as *Adam* was; but the *caſe* is as different, as *our ſtate* is from *Adams* in *his integrity*. *Adam* had no *guilt* chargeable upon him, no *corruption* inherent in him, nothing to make him *fear the wrath of God*, and conſequently nothing to diſturbe his

peace,

peace; but I know no man alive that can pretend to as much as to be without *guilt*, unleſſe perhaps Mr. *Goodwin*, who had the confidence to tell the Parliament, *That his conſcience did not condemne him of having ever wrouged man, woman, or childe, in deed or word.* All the reſt of the Saints, when at beſt, are ready to arreigne themſelves, for too too many ſinnes of all kindes; and unleſſe they be aſſured of a *pardon* for their ſinnes, and *diſcharge* from the penalty due unto them, what peace can they have in their conſciences? what comfort in GOD? yea, and albeit their *conſciences* could acquit them as fairly as Mr. *Goodwins* from all *actual ſinnes* againſt *man, woman, or childe*, yet is there (alas!) guilt enough in that they were *children*, deſcended from a *man and woman*, and ſo *conceived in ſinne, and brought forth in iniquity*; the *children* of *wrath*, aſſoon as the *children of men*. This *ſinne in the wombe*, renders them liable to *Hell*, and without an *aſſurance of being pardoned*, what comfort can they poſſibly enjoy on *Earth*? the thought of their being in continuall danger of a ſuddain *arreſt* for their *firſt Parents debt*, muſt needs diſtract them, though they never contracted any of their *owne*. *ADAM* had no ſuch *arreares* to reckon for, and conſequently he had not the ſame *diſturbances in his ſpirit*, that all his children muſt needs have, who know how fearfully he incumbred them with ſuch *a debt*, as they were *bound to pay*, albeit all he left them, poor wretches, were not enough to ſatisfie for any conſiderable *parcell* of it; that wo is them, they are *bound to pay* ſo vaſt a ſumme; and yet when they have *paid every minute* ſome part of it, they will have *nothing the leſſe to pay*; but after never ſo many years of torment *expired*, there will ſtill be an eternity of it *remaining*.

2. *Adam* had no *corruption in him*, to draw him under the *fear of Damnation*, the beſt of his children are conſcious to themſelves of an unhappy plenty of this damnable commodity. And therefore albeit they were aſſured of pardon for *all former* tranſgreſſions, they could have little peace, unleſſe they had a ſuperadded *aſſurance of like pardon* for their *future* ſinnes, though never ſo *ſmall*, and *grace* to prevent them from committing, at leaſt continuing in *greater*.

Yea, the *more graciouſly* GOD had dealt with them in pardoning their *former* ſinnes, the *leſſe mercy* could they expect for their *future*, which muſt needs proportionably carry ſo much *more guilt*, as God had vouchſafed them *more favour*. *ADAM* had no *corruption* to diſquiet his peace, his *children* have all more then enough to engage them in perpetuall vexations, and agonies; nor can any thing ſecure them leſſe then an *aſſurance* of ſuch an *intereſt in God*, as that he will *reſtrain* their corruptions by his *Spirit*, and waſh them from their ſins in his *Sonne, blood*. *ADAM* had nothing but a *poſſibility of ſinning* to diſturbe his happineſſe; *ADAM* had no cauſe but to rejoyce in the conſideration of his bleſſed preſent eſtate, no man elſe but to languiſh in the thought of his *miſerable condition*.

And ſo laſtly, though *Adam* had no *certainty of ſalvation*, yet was he farre from any *probability of damnation*; but there is a *certainty* of all his childrens *damnation*, unleſſe God pleaſe to take them into his eſpecial favour, *no poſſibility* of any of their *ſalvation*; and therefore certainly they can have no ground for comfort, but in the *gracious manifeſtation* of this

favour to them, and *ſweet aſſurance* of the *continuance* of it; ſo as to preſerve them to *Heaven*, who have of themſelves too apparent a title to *Hell*.

I yield, *ADAM had not ſuch a proportion of Grace, as could aſſure him he ſhould not ſinne and periſh*; but he had *enough* to preſerve him from it, had he been as *careful*, as *able* to keep himſelf; but *his children* have all of them ſuch a meaſure of *corruption*, as may infallibly evince a *neceſſity of their periſhing*, without the ſingular mercy of God to them in Jeſus Chriſt, and have no *ability* to *preſerve themſelves*: and therefore though *Adams condition* might admit *peace and comfort* without an *aſſurance of ſalvation*, yet *no mans elſe* can, all being ſo obnoxious to *damnation*. Shortly, *Adam* was in a *preſent ſtate* of *innocency* and *happineſſe*; and in no danger, but by an *unimaginable deluſion*, or *forgetting himſelf*; no man beſide, but is at *preſent* conſcious to himſelf of many *ſins*, and ſenſible of much *ſuffering* on *earth*, and in no capacity of being delivered from *Hell*, but by the admirable *goodneſſe of God*.

Direct. pag. 174. But ſecondly, ſaith Mr. *Baxter*, *Experience tells us, that the greateſt part of Chriſtians on earth, do enjoy that peace and comfort which they have, without any certainty of ſalvation.* But,

1. What, I pray, is the *ſpiritual peace and comfort of the greateſt part of Chriſtians on earth?* a *peace*, that *deſtroyes* them; a *comfort*, that drawes a *curſe* on them. That which you are pleaſed to call *ſpiritual peace*, is indeed but a faire degree of *carnal ſecurity*; their *peace* is but anſwerable to their *godlineſſe*, onely a *ſhadow*; their *comfort* but ſuitable to their *conſciencious neſſe*, which hath nothing of *ſubſtance* in it. The *greater part of Chriſtians on Earth*, are little more then *Heathen*, and ſeldome take into their thoughs either *Heaven*, or *Hell*. And did they ſeriouſly think on *theſe*, they would not *live* ſo *pleaſantly*, nor *die* ſo *quietly* as they uſe to do.

I have been oft aſtoniſhed to conſider, how many *called Chriſtians* that *lived* as *ſwine*, have *died* like *lambes*, without diſcovering either *ſorrow* for their *ſinnes*, or *feare* of *puniſhment*; but quietly going out of the world, without any grounds of *hope of heaven*, and yet without any *ſuſpicion* of *danger* of *Hell*. Alas! the poor ſots took neither *heaven* nor *hell* into their thoughts; that which Mr. *Baxter* calls *ſpiritual peace and comfort* in them, was onely a *ſpiritual lethargy*, and *inſenſiblineſſe*.

I wonder, he being a man (as I ſhall ſtill confeſſe) of a choice ſpirit, and one of a thouſand, ſhould have ſo good thoughts of this *ſpiritual peace and comfort of the greater part of Chriſtians on earth*, who will at laſt meet at their great Randezvous in *another humour*.

Direct. pag. 174. And ſurely all this *ſpiritual peace and comfort* which they enjoy, may very well be compared to that which a *poor condemned priſoner takes upon the report of pardon*. But I ſee little reaſon, why *his hopes of a pardon*, and his *comfort* upon thoſe *hopes*, ſhould be alledged as an Argument to prove any *ſpirituall peace and comfort may be had, without certainty of ſalvation*.

Ibid. Thirdly ſaith Mr. *Baxter*. *The nature of the thing telleth us, that the likelihood of ſo great a mercy, as everlaſting glory muſt needs be a ground of great*

comfort

thus sow. If a poor condemned prisoner do but hear that there is hope of a Pardon, specially, if very probable, it will glad his heart. Indeed if an Angel from heaven were brought into this state, it would be sad to him; But if a *Devil, or a condemned sinner have such hope, it must needs be glad newes to them. The Devils have it not, but we have.*

I shall examine the *likelihoods, which the greater part of Christians on earth have of everlasting glory*, by and by. But for the present, I shall define leave to try this.

1. That the *greatest hopes which a condemned prisoner hath of a pardon*, will not make him if he be a considering man, to eat very heartily, or sleep very soundly; but his *fear* of the *halter*, will make him swallow the *best morsels*, with some pain in his *throat*, and the fear of *hanging* on the gallowes, make him *stretch* himself on the softest bed with very *little ease*.

Let the *spirituall peace and comfort of men*, be but at this rate, their *spirituall confusion and torture* will be so much *more*, that it may well be allowed to drown it all; and the poor wretch can be said at best but to have somewhat *the lesse misery*, a very inconsiderable degree of *peace and comfort*.

2. Nay, what if this *hope* will be but a secret addition to his *torment*, (as a faint mixture of *sweetnesse* makes some things the more *unsavoury*) and only hang him up in a *devotious suspense*, whereas did he know what to trust to, he would be the *lesse tormented*.

Una salus victis nullam sperare salutem.

3. You suppose the *Prisoner hath some hopes of a pardon*, and *those very probable*; but alas, no man hath as much as the *least probability of salvation*, but upon *such grounds* as though he *do not*, yet he *may* lay a *sure foundation* of *assurance*; but of these your probabilities anon, in the *interim*.

4. You do like your self, in acknowledging that *if an Angel from heaven were brought into this state, it would be sad to him*; and I humbly conceive, if an *Angel from heaven should bring newes of a pardon* to a poor soul upon your *probabilities*, which are *no ground of Assurance*, it would not be over-*comfortable* to her.

But fifthly, If Mr. *Baxter* mean by his *greater part of Christians on earth*, such as *truly are such*; I yield, *they have not a certainty of salvation formally*, but withall I adde, that they all have it *fundamentally*, and that it is their unhappy weaknesse, that they have it not *formally*, and do not *improve those grounds* to a better *advantage*; and till they be enabled to do it, who walk more in the *darke* then these *children of light*? and who have more *agnish fits*, yea, a greater *Hellish Fever* upon their spirits, then these precious Saints, who have a *sound faith*, yet but a *faint knowledge* of it, have as much as any of the *direct* acts of faith, but are ill able to make a rational *reflexion* on them?

Now it were much more for their comfort, to open unto them the *certainty of their salvation*, in their *uncertain* and *fluctuating apprehensions* of it, then to bid them make much of those sorry *probabilities*, which Mr. *Baxter* so dexterously portraies before them. It were much better to demonstrate that their *weak faith* is a *strong ground* for their *confidence*, their *weak apprehensions clear evidences* of their *salvation*, then to nourish them with such a

messe

meſſe of *probabilities*, as will prove to be but *ſuch a diſh*, as whence they will fetch out only *empty ſpoones*; and ſuch a *viol* of *cordialls*, as will but encreaſe their *cardiacall paſſion*.

I will now briefly examine how firme grounds Maſter *Baxter* layes for a *comfortable probability*, which will not ſerve for a *certainty of ſalvation*; and hope to ſhew, that nothing but what is a *ſure ground for no leſſe then certainty*, can make out as much as a *probability* of *ſalvation* to any man.

In the beginning of this Chapter, Maſter *Baxter* referres his Reader to four heads of his probabilities which he had diſcuſſed before in foure ſeverall Chapters.

The firſt is from the *Nature of God*, whom he repreſents at large, as *infinittely merciful*. Right; but what is that to give *comfort* to a poor wretch, who knowes God to be *infinitely juſt*, as well as *mercifull*; and juſtly *condemnes himſelf* of provoking the *wrath of God*, and over and above of deſpiſing *his goodneſſe*?

The *more mercy* he hath found from God, the *leſſe* can he *comfort* himſelf in it, having ſo unworthily *undervalued it*. It is true, this *mercy of God* is that, which ſhould *render him amiable in the eyes of men*; but none but a *new man* looks upon him, as the *more lovely* for it.

The *Devils*, I am ſure, know as much of the mercy of God, as any *unregenerate men*. The *Devils* and *unregenerate men* love him alike: well, but ſaith Mr. *Baxter*,

1. *Love is effectually conſolatory in the very working.*
2. *It will breed perſwaſions of Gods love to you again.*
3. *It will be an unqueſtionable evidence of true grace, and ſo comfort.*

Be it ſo; but then this *love of God*, being an *unqueſtionable evidence of true grace*, and *true grace* as *unqueſtionable an evidence* of *Gods love to a man*. This is more then a ground for *probability*, a ground for *full aſſurance of ſalvation*. What need the poor ſoul trouble herſelf with more *queſtions of her ſalvation*, having an *unqueſtionable evidence of true grace*, and in that of *Gods love?* which if the ſoul be taught to look upon as *free* in its *firſt actings*, as *unchangeable* to the *laſt*, her diſtracting ſcruples may all be fairly diſmiſſed upon the firſt appearance of this *dear truth*.

And it is a farre more ready, and rational courſe of comforting the ſoul, to convince her of this; that *her love to God is an effect of Gods ſpecial love to her, which will not faile to ſave her*, then to tell her an odde ſtory of *Gods general love*; which is extended to *multitudes*, that ſhall *periſh eternally*, and that *thus* may be a cauſe of *a love towards God*, which yet may conſiſt with a *Reprobate condition*. Let the ſoul be poſſeſt with this, that *her love to God*, *is* the *effect of an unchangeable love of God to her*, and ſhe may reflect with a *ſecret comfort*, though with a *profeſſed* and *paſſionate abhorring* on her *former hatred of God*; and comparing her *preſent* condition with her *former*, conclude a bleſſed *change* is wrought upon her by her *unchangeable gracious* God. Thus may ſhe fetch *light* even out of *darkneſſe*; and ſweetly ſolace her ſelf with the contemplation of *Gods love* in bringing her off from *her hatred of God*. But too evident it is, that the meditation of *Gods general love* never

pro-

produced any *cordial love in man to God*; or if it did, *ſuch love* could give *no probability of the mans ſalvation*. Then only do we acknowledge *probability*, when the *Arguments pro*, weigh down thoſe that are brought *contra*; But here the ſoule may alledge much more *againſt* her ſalvation, then can be pretended *for* it: What if God bear a *general love to men?* yet the *generality of men* eternally *periſh*; and that in the unquenchable *wrath of GOD*. What hope hath the poor ſoul from ſuch a bare conſideration of *ſuch a love in God*, as he bare to *all the damned in hell?* What if this *general love of God*, have produced ſome *love to God in the ſoul?* ſo did it, according to Mr. *Baxters* Doctrine, in *many who periſh*: They had the *ſame love to God for the nature*, and perhaps *not much leſſe* for the *degree*; How can the ſoul perſwade herſelf, ſhe ſhall not receive the *ſame meaſure?* this *general love of God*, and I know not what *love to him* afford a ſorry *probability of ſalvation* to a poor wretch, who may preſently reply, *many more have miſcarried then have been ſaved*. The truth is, this diſcourſe of Mr. *Baxter* of *the general love of God*, is much of the ſtraine of Mr. *Hordt*, of *Gods love to mankinde*, which hath been long ſince ſufficiently unravelled by thoſe eminent ſervants of God, *Davenant* and *Twiſſe*. So that it is needleſſe for me to ſay more of it; only I cannot but expreſſe my ſorrow, that Mr. *Baxter* in the end of this Chapter, is bold to caſt a ſlurre on ſome *common Doctrines*, and thoſe ſuch as are to be read in *great Divines*, but called by him *notwithſtanding, ignorant, preſumptious intruſions into that which is unſearchable*, p. 23. *Giving advantage to Satan to diſquiet ſoules, and diſhonouring God as a Tyrant*, p. 22, & 25. We abborre it, and proclaime him *merciful*, yea, *bountiful* to all; but deſire leave to ſay, this *general love of God* can give *no probability of ſalvation* to any *particular man*; And that while Mr. *Baxter* endeavours to give *probabilities of ſalvation* upon *Gods general love to man*; he bereaves many a precious ſoul, of that *full aſſurance* which it might have from its *love to God*; which wherever it is found, is an undeniable evidence of Gods *ſpecial love* which ſhall never be *changed*. The true way to comfort afflicted ſoules, is to bid them ſearch, *whether they love God* which they ſhall know by their *hatred of ſin* as *diſpleaſing to God*. If they diſcover *this*, they may be ſure of *Gods ſpecial love to them*; if *not*, their portion is not *comfort*; let them *deſpaire* of it, the *deſpaire* of comfort *in this condition*, is the only way to *bring them out of it*; aſſoon as they are *brought out of it*, all the treaſures of the rich mercies of God, do fully belong to them; and they ſhall not faile to partake more, or leſſe of the comfort of them, in ſuch a time as is moſt honourable for *God* to *give it*, moſt profitable for *them* to *receive it*. *Apol.*

In the *interim*, let Mr. *Baxter* ſpeak to them, as much as he will of the *nature of Chriſts offices*, which is his *ſecond ground*; it gives no *probability* at all to them of their ſalvation, it is enough it gives a *poſſibility*. Chriſt hath no commiſſion to ſave any but *believers*, and *them* the *weakeſt* of them, the offices of Chriſt may *aſſure* of *ſalvation*. The ſame I ſay of his 3d. the *full ſufficiency of Chriſts ranſome for all, but with an efficacy for ſalvation only to Believers*. What is that to any man in an eſtate of *unbelief?* His 4th of the *fulneſſe or univerſality* of the *new Covenant*, or *law of Grace*, is a diſh which is as confidently as heſerves it in, would be a little ſeaſoned. For 1. if he mean no more then this, that *no man is excluded from ſalvation, provided he believe*, it is true;

but

but gives no comfortable *probability of salvation* to *any* but *believers*, and to *them* I trow it gives a *certainty*.

2. If he mean that there is no man but *may believe*, and so enjoy the benefit *of salvation*, it is false; for *faith* is a principal part of *Christs purchase* for the *Elect*, and no other man hath power to believe to salvation.

I cannot hold, but must say again, I am sorry I should be put to it, to draw my pen against a man whom *I* would gladly serve with all the power in my hand; and I am deeply sensible of what a right worthy Gentleman, and Friend of mine in the West, was lately pleased to signifie to me, that he feared the difference between Mr. *Baxter* and me in lesse points, might give occasion to some to think the worse of *greater ones*, wherein we both *agree*, but the question is, which of us keeps to the old Doctrine, commonly received among us. I doubt not, but as even from my minority, I in all Philosophical disputes, *I* was ever ambitious (though to finde out new Arguments and Answers, and to set a new edge upon the old ones; yet withall in a kinde of Peripatetical superstition) to maintain the common Tenets, as choosing rather to *follow*, though with lesse honour, then to *lead* with more hazard; so now in these Theological debates, wherein it hath pleased God in his providence to engage me, I shall shew my self the same man; and rather imploy my self in the *defence* of the *ancient Doctrine*, then in *discovery of new lights*; of all which I seem to discover but this, that they are *ignes fatui*. None Popishly affected shall have any advantage by *me*, to say, we are not constant to our old Masters Doctrinal principles; and if we differ in some *minutiæ*, yet is *our difference* lesse then *theirs*, who vaunt so much of their *unity*; witnesse that Catalogue of above 230. Contradictions among their Doctors, drawn by our Right Reverend Bishop *Hall*, out of their *Bellarmine* and *Navarre*. If any advantage be given them, they must thank Mr. *Baxter* for it; and surely the Church cannot but take this the *more tenderly* from him, the *better* he hath deserved of her in other things. This is her greatest grief, that she is *wounded in the house of her friend*, and by the hand of *her son* whom she so dearly respected.

I hope upon a more serious examination, he will in his ingenuity be more forward to *right* her, then he hath been to *oppose* her. Now that all our unwilling contentions, may end in the sweeter concord; and that the issue of all may be the glory of God, the clearing of his truth, the comfort of his children; and that we may all so acquit our selves, as to cut off occasion from those who desire occasion to blaspheme our holy profession, is my most hearty prayer at the Throne of Grace, and with this I shall conclude this Preface; only desiring the Reader to correct the *Errata* in the Book, ere he read any further.

Grace-Church, London, *March*, 1. 1653. GEO. KENDALL.

THE SUMME OF THIS Diſcourſe.

PREFACE,

1. *Sheweth,*

I. *AN impoſsibility of the Saints ſtanding without the eſpeciall ſupport of the power of God.*

1. *So many are the oppoſitions of the* { *World, Fleſh, Devil,* } *upon ſundry accounts.*

2. *So great are the weakneſſes of Grace, which is* { *Not able to ſubſiſt of it ſelf.* / *Apt to be abuſed by Corruption.*

3. *So little power is there in all other means to preſerve them.*

II. *An impoſsibility of the Saints falling finally or totally, in reſpect of*

1. *The ſufficiency of Gods power to preſerve the Saints.*

2. *The engagements of God to imploy his power to this purpoſe.*

2. *Cleareth the Common Doctrine from two aſperſions. That it teacheth,*

1. *An abſolute impoſsibility of their falling who have been once ſav'd.*

2. *That they ſhall be ſaved, continue they never ſo looſe,*

3. *Repreſents ſundry ſtraines of the Adverſaries Books.*

4. *Excuſeth the carriage of the Author in his diſputes.*

5. *Wipes off ſeverall ſlurres wherewith the Doctrine of Perſeverance and Aſſurance hath been ſullied by another hand, ſhewing,*

1. *What little account need be made of teſtimonies of* Lutherans *againſt it.*

2. *That not much of the doubts and diſquiets of the ſpirits of thoſe that are for it.*

3. *That no true comfort without grounds for Aſſurance.*

Adams *case different.*
The generality not considerable.
No probabilities for Salvation that are short of grounds for Assurance.

CHAP. I.

Fear what Counsellor.
Several Doctrines.
In particular, The Doctrine of Perseverance vainly pretended to be asserted out of fear.
Doctrine of Perseverance as vainly pretended to be lesse comfortable then that of Apostasie.
As vainly pretended to be a Doctrine of looseneſſe.
Which Doctrine hath greateſt influence on Holineſſe?
Whether Saints deſire continuance in love and favour of God upon the ſame grounds that Chriſt did?
Which Doctrine aſſerted by holier men, and how farre this is conſiderable?
Whether the Saints have meanes to preſerve them from the danger of Apoſtaſie, equall to thoſe men have to preſerve their natural lives?

CHAP. II.

Scriptures proving the perſeverance of the Saints Diſcuſſed.

Matth. 18.
Matth. 24. 24.
Matth. 26. 39. Gal. 4. 15. Acts 29.
Rom. 11. 18.
1 Pet. 1. 5.
1 Joh. 2. 19.
1 Joh. 3. 9.
John 10. 29.
John 13. 1.
Mal. 3. 6.
Rom. 8. 28, 29.
Eſay 49. 5.
Jer. 31. 39.
ch. 32. 40

CHAP. III.

Gods promiſes arguments of Perſeverance.

Eſay 54. 10.
Eſay 59. 21.
Hoſea 2. 20, 21. Rom. 11. 26.
Pſal. 125. 1.
John 4. 14.
John 14. 16.
1 Cor. 8. 9.
2 Theſſ. 3. 3.
1 Cor. 10. 13.
1 Theſſ. 5. 23.
Phil. 1. 6.

The immutable Election of God, an Argument of Perſeverance, what the faith of Gods Elect?

Chriſts interceſſion an Argument of Perſeverance.

John 17. *in ſeveral places.*
John 14. 6.
Luke 22. 31, 32.
Rom. 8. 35.
Heb. 7. 25.

Saints prayers an Argument of Perſeverance.

John 16. 23.
1 John 5. 14.

Chriſts preſerving the Saints to the end, an Argument for Perſeverance.

John 6. 37. 39.
John 10. 27, 28.
John 17. 12.
John 13. 1.

1 Cor.

1 Cor. 1. 8.
Eph. 5. 23.
Jude v. 1.
2 Tim. 1. 12.
Heb. 12. 2.
1 Pet. 1. 5.
The sealing of the Spirit, an Argument for Perseverance.
2 Cor. 1. 21.
Eph. 1. 13, 14.
Eph. 4. 30.
Adde to these,
Psal. 1. 3.
Matth. 7. 24, 25.
Luke 8. 8.
Finall Apostates never were true Believers.
John 8. 31.
1 Joh. 2. 19. Heb. 3. 6, 14. 1 Joh. 2. 19.
Other their Texts cleared upon this account.
Rom. 6. 2, & v. 8, 9, 10, 11.
1 John 3. 9. & 5. 4, 18.
Jude v. 3.
Apoc. 20. 6.

CHAP. IV.

Scriptures alledged by Mr. Goodwin *to prove the totall and final Apostasy of true Saints vindicated.*
Ezek. 18. 24, 25.
1 Cor. 9. 27.
Heb. 6. 4, 5, 6, 7.
Heb. 10. 38.
Matth. 13. 20, 21.
A Digression wherein is shewed a specifical difference between the graces of true Saints, and whatever like them, is found in men unregenerate.

CHAP. V.

God no respecter of persons according to our Doctrine.
A digression upon that occasion.
And that all the difference of Saints from others, is meerely made by God, shewed against Mr. Plaifer.
2. *The Ministery of the Gospel not unnecessary according to our Doctrine.*
1. Cor. 10. 12, 13. } *Vindicated.*
Heb. 6. 4, 5, 9. }
3. *God not weak in his application to men according to our Doctrine. A Digression concerning rewardablenesse of workes.*
4. *Saints in a possibility of falling away, yet their falling away impossible.*
Rom. 7. 19. *Discussed.*
5. *Christs body uncapable of dismembring.*
Regeneration not iterable.
Exod. 32. 35.
Whether names blotted out of Gods Book?
6. *The Doctrine of Perseverance no enemy to godlinesse, Doctrine of Apostasy no friend to it.*
7. *The Doctrine of Perseverance no enemy to Peace, nor the contrary a friend to it.*
8. *The Doctrine of Perseverance evacuateth not the counsels of God.*
9. *Nor begets jealousies among Saints.*

CHAP. VI.

Davids, Solomons, } *case examined.*
2 Tim. 2. 18. *opened.*
Whether Judas *were ever Regenerate?*
Lorinus *examined.*

CHAP. VII.

Vossius *examined concerning the Doctrine of the Ancients, as to this point in hand.*
Irenæus, Tertullian, Nazianzen Chrysostome, Origen, Ambrose, Cyprian, Chromatius, Macarius, Basil *the great,* Augustine *examined.*
The Lutherans, Melanchthon, Chemnitius
Calvin, Musculus, Martyr, Aretius, Bullinger, Piscator, Diodate, Junius, Mollerus.
The Saxonian *Confession.*
The Synod of Dort *Vindicated.*

Appendix.

An Index.

APPENDIX.

THe needlesseness of Baptisme according to Mr. Goodwins *grounds.*

The passages in the Authors first part, excepted against by Mr. Horne, *Vindicated.*

Philosophy needful for the Preachers of the Gospel.

Ten Arguments of Mr. Hornes *answered according to their merit.*

Which helps to take off the edge of Mr. Baxters *Book, which hath so long laine in the deck.*

And shewes the impertinency of Mr. Biddles *Illogical allegations of Scriptures for the proof of Sundry most horrid Blasphemies.*

Semel in anno ridet Apollo.

FINIS.

SANCTI SANCITI.

OR, A

VINDICATION

Of the COMMON DOCTRINE of the Perſeverance of the Saints, Preſerved by the

Power OF God

through Faith to Salvation.

CHAP. I.

In Anſwer to the ninth Chapter of Mr. Goodwins *Book, the firſt of his Digreſſion.*

Learned SIR,

YOu will pleaſe to pardon me, if I be ſomewhat the *bolder*, in the enſuing diſpute; for that your wiſdome hath ſo judiciouſly cautioned me, in the entrance of your Digreſſion, againſt the danger of feare, with [*Peſſimus Conſiliarius timor.*] It ſeems I muſt manage my buſineſſe without *feare*, unleſſe I mean to do it without *Counſel*; and therefore howbeit the Reader may finde too little *wit*, all along, to the end of my book; yet I will have a care, you ſhall not diſcover too much feare, from the very beginning of it you having ſo worthily counſelled me to be afraid of *fear*, as the *worſt Counſellour*, [*Peſſimus Conſiliarius timor.*]

Sententias loqueris; and ſuch as according to their merit, ſhall be all along diſtinguiſhed with theſe Crotchets [ ] to ſhew from what Oracle they come. But how well I pray doth this Politick ſentence agree with the ſumme of this your Scholaſtick Digreſſion? where in the whole Progreſſe, you make it your work, to exalt the honour of that bleſſed paſſion of *feare*, which here in the beginning you ſo indignely brand, as [*Peſſimus Conſiliarius.*] If it be ſo evil a Counſellour, how comes it to be commended to the Saints as the beſt *Monitor*, and whoſe cautious advice alone can keep them from ſinne and miſery? Their hope of Heaven, is rendered by

you, as prone, forſooth, to encourage them to hell; a continual Trepidation, can only afford them help, to bring them to Heaven; and ere it bring them thither, this *perpetual feare*, is according to you, a *principal Comforter* to them upon the way. The Doctrine which all along affrights them, with the *poſſibility of their falling*, is of a much *ſweeter tendency and import*, then that which is forward to tell them, upon how ſure grounds ſoever, of their *certain Perſeverance* by the *Grace of God*.

This ſentence which takes upon it ſo gravely to condemn *feare*, in the firſt line of your Digreſſion, may juſtly *feare* to hear it ſelf condemned, in the following leaſe; as guilty of High Treaſon againſt the Common-wealth of Saints, who are ſadly told, they cannot be ſafe, unleſſe they have alwayes *feare à ſecretioribus Conſiliis*, as much as here it is ſaid, as it were in plain *Engliſh*, by a certain profound *Latine* ſentence, [*Peſſimus Conſiliarius Timor.*] Yet that I may not ſeem to preſume to engage you, about myſteries of State, or take upon me to controll you, in your deep Dictates, about the choice of Privie Counſellors, wherein you are humbly acknowledged, to have long buſied your thoughts, with admirable ſucceſſe; be it for quietneſſe ſake confeſſed, that it is very true what you ſay, that [*Peſſimus Conſiliarius Timor*] it is (as the ſonne of *Syrach* ſtiles it) the betrayer of the ſuccours which Reaſon offers; but by your leave it is no leſſe true, *that the beſt Counſellours are fulleſt of feares*; and the wiſer men are, the more apt are they to be ſurprized with varieties of jealouſies. He who *increaſeth knowledge, increaſeth his feares* equally with his *ſorrowes*, as *forecaſting* the evils which *may be*, as well as *foreſeeing* thoſe which *will be*: Hence the Spaniard hath a good ſullen Proverbe, that *Every Wiſe man is melancholy thrice a day*: Confidence and fearleſneſſe have ſeldom been held commendations of Diſcretion. But [though *feare* be a bad Counſellour,] yet, ſay you, [it is very incident to the natures of men, never to think themſelves wiſer then in their *feares*: nor to be more importunely wedded to any apprehenſions, then thoſe which they conceive to be ſovereign for the prevention of evils.] I rather doubt, whether men ever think themſelves wiſe enough in their feares; in this caſe, they *feare* their wiſdome will be found folly; and that all their apprehenſions are ſhort of the evils which they *fear*; but what they apprehend [ſovereign for the prevention of evils.] they have moſt cauſe to proſecute with all poſſible diligence; the avoiding of evil being of the two more worthy their labour, then the attainment of good. I ſhould not ſo much care to get what I have not, as be unwilling to loſe what I have. Evil ſets the ſharpeſt edge on mens endeavours to ſhun it, and he hath a blunt ſpirit, that doth not flie a miſchief more then follow an advantage. You proceed and demand [with what height of confidence, and unrelentingneſſe of judgement, did the Jewes pleaſe themſelves in their opinion of Juſtification by works, through an apprehenſion that they muſt needs diſclaim, or reject *Moſes*, and the Authority of his Law and Writings, in caſe they admitted the doctrine of *Paul* concerning Juſtification by faith? whereas this Apoſtle expreſſely proves, and demonſtrates unto them, that this doctrine of his, was ſo farre from caſting prejudice in the leaſt, upon *Moſes* his Law, that indeed it did eſtabliſh it, (*i. e.*) avouch the truth and authority of it.] It ſeemes then the Jewes *feares*, had the ſtrange luck to make them *confident*; Confidence (I grant) is ſometimes the daughter of *feare*; as when a man for *feare* of *poverty feares* not *death*; yea, and for *feare of death*, doth courageouſly kill himſelf; but this is but a cowardly kinde of courage, *ne moriare mori*: But certainly this is not the caſe here, for the Jewes confidence was not out *of feare of overthrowing* Moſes *his law*; but out of an apprehenſion of *contradiction*, that *Pauls* doctrine of Juſtification carried againſt *Moſes*. And had it carried a *contradiction* againſt *Moſes*, they had had great cauſe to oppoſe *Paul*. This, good Sir, was not out of *feare*, which I thought had been an *Affection*, but out of a *miſjudging* that there was an inconſiſtency beween *Paul* and *Moſes*. And had there been ſuch an inconſiſtency between them in *truth*, as there was in the Jewes *apprehenſion*, the Jewes had had juſt cauſe for their [*confidence* and *unrelentingneſſe* in gain-ſaying *Paul.*] We are not now to conſider *affections* but *arguments*. You go on and tell us, [you verily believe, that a very conſiderable part, of thoſe doctrines and tenents, which are at this

this day held by Professors of Christian Religion, are not maintained, or held, so much upon any evidence, or confidence they have of their truth, upon those positive grounds, whether from Scripture or Reason, which they commonly plead for them; as out of apprehensions, and conceits, that the contrary Doctrines are of evil consequence, and will in one kinde or other, do them harme, in case they should give entertainment to them] And surely, first, if they can prove the contrary doctrines to be of *evil consequence*, they have good cause to maintaine their present Doctrines; for that the *evil consequence* is enough to disprove the *contrary Doctrines*; and the disproving of *one contrary Doctrine*, is a sufficient proving of *another contrary*. As to disprove and confute, that Doctrine which asserts that the *Saints may finally fall away*, is sufficient to prove, or confirme that Doctrine, which asserts that they *cannot so fall away*. Secondly, if any Doctrine will [do us harme in case we entertain it] it is clear, that Doctrine which would do so much *harme*, is not *good*, nor worth entertaining. There is no *truth* but it is also *good*. Thirdly, yet do we most insist on *positive* proofs for the Doctrine which we maintaine, and in this particular of the *Saints perseverance*, we shall make it good in the processe of this Discourse; and did we not most insist on *positive proofs* for it, to what purpose is the greater part of this your Digression, which is spent in overthrowing our Texts of Scripture, and Arguments from Reason? What [*Lactantius* reports of the Heathen, that one thing which entangled them with Idolatry, or worshipping of Idols, was a certaine fear or conceit, that all their Religion or devotion would be in vaine, in case they saw not with their eyes, something that they might worship] is not at all to your purpose: If *they* erred upon this false ground, what is that to *us*? or if [*Tertullian* held the soul to be corporeal, upon the account of fear, lest if he made not a *body* of it, he should make *nothing* at all of it,] this his making the soul a body, hath not as much as a shadow of disadvantage to us. [The Jewes restraining young men from reading the *Canticles*, and the ancient wise mens restraining the vulgar from reading *Ecclesiastes*, out of a conceit, that it contradicted it self,] [*Luthers* rejecting the Epistle of *James*, and some others the Epistle of *Peter*, upon the like account,] is just nothing to the businesse in band, and so you have been but impertinent in all this; and had as good said nothing at all, as all this, which is nothing to the purpose. While you assay to shew your *reading* you but delude your *Reader*, and abuse him with such a Preface, as might better have been put on the back-side of your book. And thus the entrance of your Digression, may very well be esteemed another Digression from your businesse.

[Concerning the doctrine, which maintaines a possibility of defection, in the Saints themselves, or true believers, unto destruction, though I am not ignorant that many, both texts of Scripture, and Arguments otherwise, have been levied, and are wont to be bronght into the field against it, yet I verily believe, that which makes Professors generally, so impatiently zealous, in their opposition of it, is not so much any satisfaction they finde, either in these Scriptures or Arguments, for the proof if that which is contrary to it, as their inconsiderate, tumultuary feares, lest this doctrine should bereave them of those inward accommodations of Peace and Comfort, which they conceive themselves to be befriended with by the other.] SECT. 2.

It seems then 1. We are not destitute of positive proofs of our Doctrine of perseverance; which here you confesse we produce; though in the former Section you would brave it out, [as if we did not much insist upon them.] 2. The [generality of Professors] are of our side; yea, and [impatiently zealous for our Doctrine.] The [generality of Professors] will weigh somewhar, their [zeale] more, their [impatient zeale] more still. And your single charging them with [*inconsiderate* and *tumultuary* feares] addes to the weight of their testimony, while you indeavour to abate it; what is one man that he should thus taxe the [generality of Professors?] It seems he is sufficiently confident that thus chargeth them with feares; but though the more confident, nothing the more considerate: It seems by you [the generality of Professors finde themselves much *befriended*, with inward accommodations of peace and comfort by this doctrine of perseverance,] but you think they are but

befooled by it. Your wiſdome will be thought little the greater, for putting the fool on the [generality of Profeſſors] Or is it ſo credible that they put a general fallacy upon themſelves, as that you will be found guilty of Sophiſtry, in eſſaying to demonſtrate it? I appeal to all ſober men, whether the [generality of Profeſſors] weigh not down Mr. *Goodwin*, and all his numerous Congregation at *Coleman-ſtreet*? whether if the [generality of Profeſſors finde ſo much peace and comfort in the doctrine of perſeverance] we be like to finde truth and evidence in the doctrine of Apoſtaſie? But well fare a good heart; you will ſet your ſelfe to demonſtrate, not only that your [doctrine of Apoſtaſie, hath every whit as ſure, and full a conſiſtency, with the peace, and comfort of the Saints, as that contrary to it, but that of the two it is of a farre better and more healthful complexion to make a Nurſe for them: and when you have cleared the innocency, and inoffenſiveneſſe of it, in reſpect of the peace and comfort of men, and ſo ſhall have reconciled it unto their affections; it will be no great maſtery (you conceive) to gain in their judgements unto it afterwards.]

If you have no better skill in Phyſiognomie, few wiſe Mothers will truſt you to chuſe [Nurſes] for their children; ſurely this [Nurſe-like doctrine] hath a moſt melancholy face, a ſad, ſwarthy countenance, over-run with the black Jaundiſe, enough to fright any childe of God with the very look of it at the diſtance of halfe a mile: it carries *feares* and perplexities in its eyes, while it looks towards Heaven it hath hell before it; while it ſmiles it ſighes; while it hath moſt pleaſantneſſe in its cheeks, it hath pantings at his heart; it is ſick of a quotidian Ague; it is daily tormented with ſhiverings of ſpirit; in the midſt of laughter it is ſorrowful, and while it ſeems to triumph in admiration of the goodneſſe of God, it is diſtracted with languiſh and amazement, and in the greateſt exultations of faith, it is ſecretly ſhall I ſay, or ſenſibly racked with the torment of *feare*. And is this ſuch a ſweet [*Nurſe*?] your Rhetorick, (though I confeſſe you have as much as any man I trade with) is not able to plaiſter a tolerable complexion, on ſo deformed a piece? If you can give Beautie to this Hagge, you may hope next to gild darkneſſe, with the rayes of light, and to cloath miſery, with the habit of bleſſedneſſe; ſo as to make men fond of vexation, and enamour'd on uglineſſe,

Monſtrum, horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.
—— Metuenda voluptas
Cernenti, pulchérque timor.

SECT. 3. I muſt needs allow it for an [eaſie maſtery to gaine in the judgements of the Saints, if ever you reconcile this opinion to their affections] you may as ſoon cajole fire and water, the diaphaneity of Heaven, and the opacity of the earth; and perſwade them to embrace, yea to lie in each others boſome. And yet me thinks, this is not ſo Doctor-like ſaid, [that you will firſt attempt to reconcile it to their affections, and then to their judgements] you know who they are, that *ſuadent, priùs quàm docent*. That doctrine which firſt falls a courting the affections, deſerves to finde ſorry entertainment from the judgement: And ſo I beleeve yours is like to ſpeed; the judgement is not a little ſowred, which makes too much of this ſweet doctrine of yours.

[I muſt crave leave, (the truth and dear intereſt of the precious ſouls of men ſo commanding me) to affirme, that the doctrine of Perſeverance, ſo much magnified amongſt us, as it is commonly taught and received, is in the nature and proper tendency of it, very obſtructive, yea, and deſtructive unto the true peace, and ſound comfort of the ſouls of men.]

I muſt here reply, that inſtead of [reconciling your doctrine to the affections of the Saints] you only go about to bring them out of love with *ours*: You knew no other way to beautifie the face of your doctine, but by ſullying that of *ours*; to make yours white, you black *ours*. This is but an odious way of winning love, to work hatred againſt your Corrival: But when all is done, this dirt which you caſt on our doctrine, will be wiped off with a wet finger. If, ſay you, [we ſhall diligently

gently enquire after the common and ordinary cauſes of thoſe doubts and feares, ſo incident to the Profeſſors of Religion, and alſo of thoſe extreme burnings and ragings of Conſcience, wherewith both ſuch perſons and others] what have we to do with them? [who are ſometimes moſt grievouſly handled and tormented, we ſhall finde them, if not univerſally, yet generally, and with very few Caſes of exception, to be theſe with their fellowes; negligence, and ſlothfulneſſe, in watching over their hearts, and wayes; omiſſion of known duties, formality in ſervices, unprofitableneſſe in their courſe and callings, non-proficiency in grace, and eſpecially the frequent-prevailings, and breakings out of baſe corruptions, vile affections, noiſome luſts, &c. Therefore what doctrine ſoever is in the nature, frame, and conſtitution of it, apt to lead men into ſuch ſnares of death, muſt needs be full of enmity againſt the inward peace, and comfort of their dear ſoules. And what doctrine can there lightly be, of a more apparent and notorious tendency this way, then that which promiſeth unto men, and that with height of aſſurance, under what looſeneſſe, vile practices ſoever, exemption, and freedome from that puniſhment, the feare and dread whereof is the ſtrongeſt and ſharpeſt bridle, which God himſelf hath put into the lips of the unruly fleſh in men, to reſtrain it from ſinne; yea, and which the ſtrength and ſharpneſſe of it notwithſtanding, the fleſh many times deſpiſeth and laugheth to ſcorne, and diſdains to be reclaim'd or held in by it; And is not that doctrine of Perſeverance, commonly taught, and beleeved amongſt us, of this very calculation, tendency and import?]

I anſwer, No, nothing ſo; You have indeed aſſigned the true ſource of all the [ragings and diſtempers of the Saints ſpirits but you have ſlandered our doctrine of Perſeverance in making her guilty of it, alas ſhe is farre from promiſing men aſſurance of Heaven in the midſt of ſuch exorbitancie; She ſaith no man ſhall come thither, till he hate ſinne as well as puniſhment, and dread ſinne as well as death; yea more, as that which is the ſting of death; ſhe doth not exempt men from feare of puniſhment, though ſhe excite them by hope of pardon; ſhe looks on the frown of Gods face, as ſadly as on the ſtroke of his hand; and on every light ſtroke of his hand, as a heavy blow; She bids the Saints feare the ſmalleſt corrections of their diſpleaſed Father; do you think there is no feare of loſing his favour, becauſe none of loſing the inheritance? no feare of being whipped, becauſe none of being hanged? none of being put from his table, becauſe none of being caſt out of his houſe? none of ſuffering, becauſe none of being damned? good Sir, the feare of thoſe ſmaller chaſtiſements, produceth greater effects on the Saints, then the feare of the greateſt judgements do on others. There is no leſſe feare in them, though of leſſe evils: and this fear of leſſe evils, is a ſtronger [bridle] to them, then the fear of greater to others; yet is not this fear ſo ſtrong a [bridle] as is that hope, which you think, lets the *reines looſe*. *He that hath this hope purifies himſelf even as God is pure.* The Saints hope makes them *afraid* to offend; and the ſenſe of Gods *love* works *farre* more kindely upon their ſpirits, then that of *wrath*; *feare* is a ſorry *keeper* of *innocency*; He who forbeares to offend chiefly for *feare* of ſuffering, forbeares but out of *love of himſelf*, joyned with an *hatred of God*. *Naturale eſt odiſſe quem times.* Your diſcourſe of *feare* bewrayes a *vile diſtemper* of ſpirit. The Saints hearts tell them, *They feare the Lord for his goodneſſe; there is mercy with him, therefore ſhall he be feared*; and albeit there were *no hell hereafter*, conſcience is a *hell* to them at *preſent*, upon every tranſgreſſion. The [*burning of luſts*] ſets their hearts a *fire*, with indignation againſt themſelves. Lord what a fearful combuſtion is here made, by every ſingle *ſpark*? The [*raging of anger.*] ſets them in a *holy fury* againſt themſelves; and either of theſe ſo inflames their conſciences, that *Tophet* it ſelfe is not more fearful to them. [*Negligence in watching over their hearts*] is as a *beacon on fire*, and calls their hearts to a more *diligent watch* and *ward*. Their [*ſlothfulneſſe*] is a *ſpurre* to their *ſolicitouſneſſe*, each *omiſſion* of known duties, tells them it is their duty to *redeem* it with care; and the omiſſion of a *duty* proves an invaſion upon their peace; formality in ſervices jerks them to the *Power of godlineſſe*, [unprofitableneſſe in their courſe and callings,] calls them

1 John 3. 3.

Pſal. 130. 4.

of course, to carry themselves so, as their profiting may appear to both themselves and others; the [*prevailings* and *breakings* out of base corruptions,] *prevail* to the *breaking* of their spirits with *grief*: and the *breaking out* of one corruption proves the *breaking down* of many; [*vile affections*] affect them with the sense of their own *vilenesse*, that they *abase* themselves and *exalt* God, so much the more, [*noisom lusts*,] make them run to the *Spouses garden*, and perfume themselves with his *odours* shortly the more they *stink* in their own nostrils, the more they love the savour of Christs *ointments*, and in an abhorrency of *themselves*, adore the goodnesse of their *Saviour*. Thus the *evil* of their hearts helps to make them the *better*, by putting them out of conceit with themselves, and sending them with teares to the throne of grace, for mercy to pardon, and help to purge out their corruptions; and when their corruptions *prevaile on them*, they *strive* the more to *prevaile with God*, and *will not let him go*, till they wrest a blessed power over their cursed iniquities. They look on these iniquities as the worst enemies, and feare not hell more then their wicked hearts. It seems by this passage of yours, you are not so well acquainted as you would be thought, with the holy *ingennity*, that is every where to be found in the breasts of Saints; whose poor soules feare nothing more, then these sharp pricks of their pleasures of sin; the pleasure of sin is not so *short*, but the prick of it lasts *long*, and is not wont to be fetch'd out, but that they are put to many *new pains*, ere they recover their *old ease*. He who hath felt what it is to *repent*, cannot but of course feare to *offend*.

SECT. 4. [If it be said, yea, but they who teach the doctrine of perseverance, teach withall, yea urge and presse the necessity of the use of such means, which God hath appointed to inable men to persevere; I answer, It is in vaine to perswade or presse men to the use of such meanes in any kinde, which are in themselves distasteful and unpleasing unto them, when they are ascertained and secured before-hand, that they shall not faile of the end howsoever, whether they use such means or no.]

1. I reply, that you seem not acquainted with that *holy pleasure*, which the Saints finde in *the use of these means*, which is to them *sweeter* then any thing, save only the *end*. Good Sir, we finde a *pleasure*, not only in *doing our duty*, but in a *sorrow for not doing it*; we finde a pleasure in our very *sighes* and *teares*; *Est quadam flere voluptas*; and would not exchange it for all the sorry mirth of the world; we finde no *pleasure* like that of *Gods house*; and the *use of his ordinances*, wherein he vouchsafes to fill us as with *marrow and fatnesse*; and being filled with this *holy pleasure*, we delight as much in *curbing* our *imaginations*, as others do in *flattering* them: in *ripping* up our *lusts*, as others do in *sowing pillowes* under them. Our *feare* of God carries a secret *joy* in it; and we openly professe to prize it beyond all the jollity of silly worldlings. The rougheſt *discipline*, wherewith the Saints are wont to exercise themselves hath much more true *pleasure* in it, then all the *delights*, wherewith the *flesh* and the *world*, yea, or *Satan* himself can tempt them. It is our *heaven on earth*, to do the will of our *Father in heaven*.

2. Who I pray [assures the Saints that they shall not faile of the end, whether they use the meanes or no?] you are pleased to impose this on us, we disclaim it, yea, defie it; you do here but build a *Castle in the aire*, which you may besiege and take at your pleasure. We have none such in our *quarters*.

[If it be replied, that the Teachers I speak of, do not promise Perseverance in faith, unto the end, but only to those, who shall use the means appointed by God, for the obtaining of it; I answer, if this indeed be the tenour of their doctrine, mine and theirs are no more two, but one and the same. I am as willing as the most zealous of them in their way, to give that great pledge of heaven, the Word of the living God unto the Saints, to secure them of their standing unto the end, upon the use of the meanes, which God hath prescribed in order thereunto.] You are so, but *you* make their *use of these means* the *fruit* of their own improvement, of their *universal grace*, *we* derive it from the *root* of Gods *special* favour; and conceive they have more *happinesse* in having God to ingage himself, for preserving them in the use of these meanes, albeit you think it to be more *honour* to the Saints, to owe it only to the

the better managing of their own free-will. Shortly, you but ſay, [they ſhall perſevere, if they continue to uſe theſe meanes,] which is as if you had ſaid, *they ſhall perſevere*, if *they ſhall perſevere*; we ſay, God, as he hath appointed them to the *end*, ſo alſo to the *meanes*, and will ſave them from a *total, final non-uſe of the meanes*, that he may bring them ſafe to the *end*; You ſay. *God will ſave them upon condition they perſevere*; *We* ſay, God will *irreſiſtibly* help them to *perſevere*, that he may *certainly ſave them*. This you ſay is an [additional ingredient, wherewith we blend the clear and ſimple tenour of our doctrine, yet if we produce any ſuch decree as this, it ſhall be an end of all ſtrife, between you and us, as to this point immediately. But how little there is to evince any ſuch decree, in all that we are wont to alledge and argue to that purpoſe, ſhall ſufficiently appear upon the examination, whereunto you intend to bring it in due time.]

In good time, ſay I, if you overthrow what we alledge to this purpoſe; we are content our doctrine fall with it; but when you have ſaid the moſt you can againſt it, our doctrine will be ſo farre from *ſhaking*, that it will *ſettle* the faſter, and laugh all your oppoſition to ſcorne. I am confident, I ſhall only *ſpend time*; the truth will *loſe nothing* by all you have to ſay againſt us. I have hitherto all along found your greateſt ſtrength to be but a braving weakneſſe. You may hope to baffle us, we need not feare you will beat us.

2. [As that doctrine of Perſeverance, whereof Profeſſors make ſuch a treaſure, is deeply acceſſary to the greateſt part of thoſe feares, thoſe wringings and gripings of conſcience, wherewith their peace is interrupted, and their comforts appaled and ſhaken: ſo is it exceedingly to be feared, that it hath a potent and pernicious influence of cauſality, into thoſe frequent, daily, and moſt ſad Apoſtaſies, and declinings from the wayes of holineſſe unto looſeneſſe and prophaneneſſe, which are found amongſt them.] SECT. 5.

I anſwer, it ſeems you are not over-well ſtored with men, who are already faine to muſter the ſame man a ſecond time. Good Sir, how came this doctrine of Perſeverance, to be guilty of the feares and gripings of conſcience in Profeſſors, but, as it was ſuppoſed to draw them off from the wayes of holineſſe? this was the firſt. And now you produce this ſame a ſecond time, that it hath [a potent influence of cauſality on their daily declinings.] This hath [a potent influence of cauſality,] upon a confidence in my ſpirit, that all you are like to ſay againſt our doctrine, will be farre from ſhaking and appaling it.

But 2. Perhaps your meaning is, that this doctrine of Perſeverance betrayes men to a total Apoſtaſie; and ſo as it makes them *full* of *feare* while they *ſtand*, as before; ſo now it makes them *fall* through *want of feare*. Be it ſo, but ſurely if upon their *fallings* into [omiſſions of duties, formalities of ſervices, &c.] they be apt to fall into [gripings and wringings of conſcience] there is little feare, but their [gripings and wringings of conſcience] for *ſmaller ſinnes*, will prevent their running riot into *greater*. I am ſtill to ſeek how this doctrine of Perſeverance can be ſo unhappy as to perplex them with *feares* for ſinne, and let them looſe into a *fearleſneſſe* of ſinning to a final Apoſtaſie: But I perceive you deliver this not without ſome little [*feare*.] Others would ſay with as much *wit*. For,

3. Were Profeſſours conſcious to themſelves of any ſuch [influences] this doctrine had upon them, they would be farre from [prizing it as a *treaſure*,] which you jeeringly acknowledge they do. To ſay they [prize that as a *treaſure*,] which is guilty of ſo much *treaſon* againſt their precious ſoules, is to *condemn the generation of the righteous*, and that of the moſt prodigious *folly*. Your *condemning them*, helps not a little to the *juſtifying* of our doctrine. Albeit Mr. *Goodwin*'s wit ſerve him to put ſuch a *vizard* upon her; Profeſſors are not ſuch ſots as to fall in love with it ſo paſſionately, were this her native complexion. You cannot repreſent our doctrine ſo *foule*, but you muſt render [Profeſſors, who thus dote upon it,] as *fooliſh*, and you acknowledge the [generality] of them ſtand thus affected to it. But

4. Albeit you charge [*Profeſſors*, with declinings into looſeneſſe and prophaneneſſe,] which

which are found ſomtimes, yea too often amongſt them.] Yet you will have much ado to prove this charge againſt *true believers*; I mean as to a *total* or *final* declining: and for the *Profeſſors* who are not *true believers*, what wonder is it if they loſe their leaves, which never had no root? if they [decline into looſeneſſe and open prophaneneſſe,] whoſe beſt religion was but a handſomer cover for irreligion? Such men, we yield, *turne the grace of God into wantonneſſe*, and a *falſe conceit* of *their intereſt* in God, may eaſily draw them to ſhew a *true contempt* of him; but as for *true*, though *weak believers*, you reckon too faſt, when you ſay, that [when the fleſh, or that which is corrupt, carnal and ſenſual in a man, (a principle not only in being, but even vigorous, more then enough in the greateſt and beſt believers) ſhall be intoxicated with ſuch a luſcious and fulſome conceit as this, that it hath goods laid up to the dayes of eternity, hath it not the temptation of that fooliſh man, as he is called, upon it, who upon a conceit that he had goods laid up for many yeares, encouraged his ſoule unto vanity; *Soule, take thine eaſe, eate, drink and be merry?*]

For ſure [the carnal, corrupt and ſenſual part of man] findes no ſuch [luſciouſneſs] in this conceit, that it hath ſuch ſtore of *grace* laid up for it to *eternity*. Grace is ſo farre from being [*luſcious*] to the ſenſual part, that it's *loathſome* to it. It *ſavours* of nothing but *death* to its *corruption*; it hath a ſting more pricking then that of *death*: what the [corrupt, carnal and ſenſual part of man] take pleaſure in a conceit, that the Spirit will not faile to over-rule, extinguiſh and extirpate it? Can you think the *ſenſual* part will be *lift up* with a conceit it ſhall be *ſubdued? bear it ſelf aloft* upon a conceit it ſhall be *beaten down*? the earthly part of man (good Doctor) would take little pleaſure in *heavenly glory* there, and much leſſe in grace here, they are not ſo lovely in its eyes, or ſo pleaſing to its palate, as you ſadly pretend: What ſo bitter to the fleſh as a conceit, it ſhall be hamper'd by the Spirit, and put as it were under *axes and harrowes*? the more of theſe *true goods* are *laid up* for us, the more the fleſh is apt to *lay againſt* them, as looking on *theſe goods* as the *foreſt evils*; ſo then, that which you ſay of this [luſcious conceit] is but a fulſome one; and had I let fall ſuch a dictate, I ſhould have thought my ſelf [intoxicated] when I wrote it. What the ſoule bid her ſelf *eate, drink, and be merry*, upon a dull conceit, that ſhe ſhall have theſe good graces of *repentance* and *holy ſorrow*? poſſibly the *ſenſual part* may fall upon *eate, drink, and be merry*, to *baniſh* theſe *melancholy thoughts*; but theſe *thoughts* are too *auſtere* to make her ſo *jolly*.

Did your [corrupt, carnal and ſenſual part] ever ſtirre you up to laugh, becauſe you heard God would bring you to weep for your ſinnes? did it ever ſet you upon a *pinne*, becauſe you heard God would put a *prick* under you? did it ever perſwade you to go out of the way, becauſe you heard God would bring you into it with his *rods*, and turn your *face with weeping to Sion*? I ſee your corruptions are of another making, then thoſe of ordinary Profeſſors. I wiſſe the thought of theſe *goods laid up for us to the dayes of eternity*, makes us *pleaſe* our ſelves in the *evils* of *ſuffering*; it makes us as much *diſpleaſed* with our ſelves in the *evil* of *ſinne*; it makes us *rejoyce in the Lord*, when we ſee nothing but vexation encountring us in the world; it doth not allow us to *take pleaſure in the world*, when the Lord *writes bitter things againſt us*. Heark, I pray, how tuneably this ſounds? *Soul eat, drink and be merry*, for thou canſt not ſinne, but God will be ſure to make thee *eat, as it were, aſhes like bread, and mingle thy drink with teares*; and amidſt the *noiſe of thy viols thou ſhalt mourn and chatter as a turtle*; thou canſt not run looſe, but God will *ſcourge* thee home again into the *bond of Covenant*; this ſounds as coming from the *ſenſeleſſe*, rather then the [*ſenſual*] part of man. *Epicurus* his beaſt would have ſpoken more reaſon. Well on,

[When a man that ſtands, is in any capacity of falling, is it not the only way to educe that power into act, and to cauſe him to fall indeed, to perſwade him he is in no poſſibility of falling?]

Right, but which of the Saints perſwade themſelves they are in [no poſſibility of falling?] they finde it by unhappy experience, that they *fall ſeven times a day*, and would

would abhorre him that ſhould ſay, He that thinks he ſtands, let him take no heed leſt he fall; they know themſelves in ſuch a [*capacity of falling*,] that it is *impoſſible* they ſhould ſtand, were they not ſupported more by *Gods hand* then their own *feet*, they acknowledge themſelves in ſuch a [*capacity of falling*] that they ever fall upon their *knees*, and humbly pray God to uphold them, only when they fall they lay hold on *Gods hand*, which raiſeth them; to perſwade them that they are out of [capacity of falling] away, by *Gods goodneſſe*, makes them eſteem his *grace* the *more*, feare their own *corruption* nothing the *leſſe*. What if [*Agag* being full of this conceit, *Surely the bitterneſſe of death is paſt*, came (as the Text ſaith) unto *Samuel delicately*] the Saints know, they are not *paſt ſinning* as long as they *live*, and *ſinne* is as *bitter* as *death* to them, and makes them *come unto God* in all humility, covering themſelves with *ſackcloth*, that he may cover them with Chriſts *robe*. [When the fleſh ſhall be taught to ſay, *Surely the bitterneſſe of eternal death is paſt*, I am out of all danger, all poſſibility of ſuffering the vengeance of eternal fire; is it not (ſay you) a ſecret and bewitching encouragement to it, to wax wanton againſt Chriſt, and to feed foule upon the ſinful delicacies of this preſent world?] It is ſo; But who teacheth the fleſh this leſſon? is this, to teach the Spirit that it ſhall have help to *keepe down the fleſh*, an encouragement to the fleſh to *riſe againſt the Spirit*? is this, to ſay that every ſinful *motion* makes an hurly burly in the ſoule, the way to encourage its *riſing*? when it is ſaid *withall*, *the Spirit* ſhall have ſtrength to *beat the body*, as it were; *black and blew*; and bring it into ſubjection to the Spirit, as the Spirit is to Chriſt, Is this the way to make the fleſh [*wax wanton againſt Chriſt*,] to ſay the Spirit ſhall not *want aſſiſtance from Chriſt*, to overcome the fleſh, and crucifie it with its luſts and affections? is this the way to tempt the fleſh to feed [foul upon the ſinful delicacies of this preſent world] to threaten it with this, that the Spirit ſhall make it drink *vineger and wormwood* for it? theſe *comforts* to the Spirit, are we had thought, as great *terrours* to the fleſh: [Not only the diſtinct ſound (ſay you,) but any confuſed blaſt of ſuch a trumpet, as this, is ſufficient to prepare the fleſh, to a battel of ſenſe and ſenſuality.] Good Sir, this [Trumpet] ſounds a *retreat* to the fleſh, not a *march*; it bids it *flie*, not *charge*; is this an *alarum* to the *fleſh*, to tell it it ſhall be *routed*, and that the Spirit ſhall conquer even when it is foiled, and carrie the day when it ſeems to have loſt it? that though there be little more then weakneſſe and wounds in it, yet it ſhall prove too hard for the fleſh, and chaſtiſe it with briers and thornes. This [Trumpet] is weapon enough to chaſe away the luſts of the fleſh; and the very *ſound* of it ſerves to put them to flight.

You conclude, [they ſeem not to be much acquainted with, at leaſt not much to conſider the *genius* of that principle in men we now ſpeak of; I mean the fleſh, who think there is any way ſo proper or probable to hamper it, and break the heart and ſtrength of it, as the iron yoke of the feare and dread of the worme that never dieth.] Alas, Sir, we have too much [acquaintance,] if it pleaſed God, with the untoward [*genius*] of this unhappy [principle,] and finde by ſad experience, the *law in our members rebelling againſt the law of our minde*; but withal, we have had as ſweet experience of the [*genius*] of the Spirit, and finde, that though the fleſh be apter to be reſtrained by feare, yet the Spirit is better enabled to do it by hope. We finde that the Spirit receives its ſtrength, not by the preaching of the Law, ſo much as of the Goſpel, and that the Promiſes of this have a more potent influence on it, then the threatnings of that. We finde that faith works much more kindly and effectually by love; and gives us a greater victory over the fleſh, as well as the world. The thought of the worme that never dies, works not ſo much on it, as the thought of the Crown which never fades, hell hath but a cold operation in compariſon of Heaven. *The expectation of the glory which ſhall be revealed*, the experience of the earneſt of that glory, the aſſurance of our intereſt in Chriſt, of the Spirits influence upon us, of the joy in ſorrowes, and comfort in croſſes, is that which raiſeth our ſpirit to a holy courage, and ſtrengthens us to lay the luſts of the fleſh, heapes upon heapes. Theſe our *hopes* are they that make us *Conquerours*; our *feares* of hell are more *cowardly*; and all feare is ever attended with a nurture of ha-

tred. Then do we [hamper the fleſh,] moſt, when we look upon it, as that, which not only *cannot enter into heaven*, but would *keep us out*; when we look on her *luſts*, as debaſing us *below our ſelves*; and making us *leſſe then men*, who ſhould be *like to the Angels*; as rendring us like *beaſts*, who were made *Partakers of the divine Nature*; as ſhaming our *firſt Creation*, when as we are made *new creatures*; as ſilly, ſottiſh, vile things, when as our ſoules are ennobled with higher principles; and hold it their greateſt *glory*, to be *aſhamed* of theſe *ſordid* acts: Then doth the Spirit moſt [hamper the fleſh] when it looks upon it as a ſlave and vaſſal; as one that *diſhonours* it, every time it is ſet at *liberty*. This is the courſe that the Spirit takes to *lift up* her ſelf, and *keep down* the fleſh: And yet being privie too, to the baſe temper of the fleſh, it hath yokes, and fetters, and manicles for it too: and caſteth it as a rotten thing to the [wormes] you ſpeak of. We do not take down *feare*, while we cry up *hope*. We bid the *fleſh feare*, while we ſay to the *Spirit Courage*; only we finde, that no *feare* can work ſufficiently upon the *fleſh*, which though it *ſlink* out one way, is apt to *ſneak* in another; while it *ebbes* in one place, to *flow* as much in another. We finde that this *ſlave* is not conſiderably mended by the beating of *feare*, only the Spirit being ſtrengthened by *hope*, keeps it ſelf above it; and as often as the *fleſh* raiſeth up its *head*, the *Spirit* is ready to lay it at its feet. Shortly, it is but a rotten kinde of purity, that is bred of the [wormes;] that which is true and genuine, is engendered by *hope*; whereas you are pleaſed to twit us with our [unacquaintance with the *genius* of the fleſh] we wiſh you had more cauſe for it: as much at leaſt, as we have to taxe you, as a ſtranger to the workings of the Spirit.

§. 6. [If it be ſaid, Yea, but it cannot be proved, that any of thoſe who decline from religious courſes unto looſeneſſe, how many ſoever they be, that thus miſcarrie, ever were true believers; or if ſuch, that they continued in their declinings without an holy recollection of themſelves, before the end: To this I anſwer four ſeveral wayes.

1. Be it ſuppoſed, (which yet will never be proved) that all they, who fall away from a Profeſſion of faith and holineſſe, without riſing again, or returning, were never true believers, yet it cannot be denied (and it is commonly granted) by men of contrary judgement, but that many of them were, or might be in a very faire, probable and hopeful way of obtaining true faith, of being made ſound Believers. Now that doctrine, whoſe nature and proper tendency is, to take men off from the meanes, to turne them aſide out of the wayes of life and peace; or which is the ſame, of ſound believing, is every whit as much, if not more anti-evangelical, as that, which directly occaſioneth ſuch miſcarriages, in thoſe who do truly believe, ſo that there is nothing gotten by that pretence howſoever.]

I anſwer, 1. That you indeed who make faith the product of mans bare endeavours, may allow your ſelfe to talk of mens being in a [very faire, probable and hopeful way of obtaining true faith;] but *we*, who look on faith, as the ſole work of the Spirit of God upon our hearts, cannot finde any thing in our ſelves, till Gods *Spirit blow on us*, which can put us into ſuch a [faire, probable and hopeful way of obtaining true faith, or being made ſound believers.] God is pleaſed to *bring* thoſe into the way, who *run* quite out of it; None put themſelves into a [way to obtain faith;] or either to *make* themſelves, or to be [*made* ſound believers.]

2. I deny that there is ought in the [native tendency] of our doctrine of Perſeverance, to put men [out of the way] *wherein* God *may give* them true faith, and make them ſound believers; this doctrine is a *way whereby* God is pleaſed rather to give faith.

3. Did it put ſome men [off from believing?] it followes not it is [anti-evangelical.] How many *doctrines of Chriſt* have had ſuch an unhappy effect, by accident, on the ſoules of men? You may remember who heard ſomewhat from Chriſt, and ſurely he heard nothing [anti-evangelical,] which made him turne off with *diſcontent*, as being unwilling to loſe the world to gaine *Heaven*; and ſo went off with *ſorrow*, from that, which alone could lead him to *true joy*.

4. It

4. It is yet a greater Paradox, that that which puts [*unbelievers* off from the way of life and peace, ſhould be more anti-evangelical] then that which turnes off *believers*. The *doctrine of the Goſpel* is enough to ſcare off *unbelievers*, nothing but what is *contrary* to that doctrine puts *believers* to a ſtand; the *doctrine* of the *Spirit* turnes off *unbelievers*; none but the *deluſions* of the *world*, the *fleſh*, or the *devil*, put back *believers*. And thus, whereas you ſay, we have [gotten nothing by this pretence;] it is clear, we have loſt nothing by that reply. But, ſay you,

Secondly, [if there be any perſons under heaven, who may upon ſufficient grounds, and juſtifiable by the Word of God, be judged true believers, many of thoſe Apoſtates we ſpeak of, were to be judged ſuch.]

I anſwer, it matters not what *you* judge them, *God* judged otherwiſe of them: for what if [all the viſible lineaments of a true faith were in their faces?] there was not *one* in their hearts. God judgeth not according to the *countenance*, but the *conſcience*: what if [as farre as the eye of man is able to pierce, they *lived godlily, righteouſly, and ſoberly in this preſent world*?] *God ſeeth not as man ſeeth*; He ſaw their *godlineſſe* to be but *ſuperficial*; *godlineſſe* which had nothing of *God* in it, but a pretence to *ſerve God*, to ſerve their own turnes; *a forme of godlineſſe*, without the *power* of it; yea, *having the forme*, to *deny the power*: He ſaw their *righteouſneſſe* to be but Phariſaical, and aiming more at their *own intereſt* then *others welfare*; *righteouſneſſe*, which at beſt was, if not a *menſtruous cloth* and a *polluted rag*, yet but a *faire cloth* caſt over *foule pollutions*, and ſhamefully ſtained with them: He ſaw their *ſobriety* to be but an abſtinence from ſome *groſſer beaſtlineſſe*, which yet allowed it ſelf a more *refined kinde of impurity*, and that when they were moſt *ſober in meats and drinks*, they were *intemperate in other things*; and in *particular* drunk with pride or covetouſneſſe, ſurely not *wiſe to ſobrietie*. It matters not what was their carriage, as to the *preſent world*, he ſaw they had no thought of *that to come*, and that all this was but *earthly morality*, never looked towards heaven; and proceeded more out of *awe* of *men*, then *feare*, eſpecially *love* of *God*. What ſpeak you of theſe mens [acting zealouſly for God, yea as any true believer?] I wis God looks to their *intentions*, and meaſures their *actings* by them, accordingly finding them not to *intend*, he doth not own them as *acting* for him. Tuſh, when you think [they acted for God; God knowes they never *thought* of him; and as for their [zealous actings] their zeale was never inkindled from *his Altar* but their *own chimneys*. True believers act truly zealouſly for God, the fire of their zeale is from holy Cenſers; the other is but *ſtrange wilde fire*: what mean you to ask, [Is any true believer fruitful in good works?] then to anſwer, [So were they.] What you look on as *fruit*, God counts but *leaves*, and *withered* ones too. Their *good works* are to him but more *ſpecious ſinnes*; their *fruitfulneſſe* in *theſe good works* but a *wretched barrenneſſe*. True beleevers, though they may ſeem *leſſe laden* with *fruit*, yet their *fruit*, though *ſeemingly leſſe*, is *real* and *ſound*; the other is all but like the *apples of Sodome*; duſt and aſhes under a faire skin. We *deny* not, but we *reverence* and *honour* the faire ſhew; yea, ſhame our ſelves, that we have *leſſe to ſhew* then *ſome of them*. We honour the *gilding* of thoſe *painted ſepulchres*, and bluſh to think that their *rottenneſſe*, ſhould be better put off then our *ſincerity*. We honour the *colour* of theſe *whited walls*, and are ſorrie that their *clob* ſhould be fairer then our *Stone-work*. We grant theſe men the [lovely characters of faith and holineſſe in their exaltation] and are abaſed in our ſelves, to think that *we* in whoſe *hearts* God hath written his law, ſhould have leſſe of it legible in our *foreheads*; but ſtill we know, that God ſaw theſe men had the *odious mark of the beaſt*, notwithſtanding their [lovely characters of holineſſe;] we are content to *exalt them*, and *abaſe our ſelves*. God (we know) will *abaſe them* and *exalt us*; and nothing the leſſe for *humbling our ſelves*, in the ſenſe of our imperfections, and *honouring them* for theſe practices, in many of which they went as farre *above us*, as they fall *ſhort of heaven*. There is not any of the Saints in Scripture, but for ſome *moral vertues*, he was exceeded by ſome of the Heathens. But we know, if their *vertue* were *more*, their *piety* was *leſſe*, yea, none at all. What wonder if Apoſtates went ſo farre as you pretend? ſome Pagans went *further*, yet never came within

kenne of the *Kingdom of heaven*; and as they have not attained to *glory*, ſo neither were they qualified with *grace*. Whiles the Apoſtates *ſtood*, we had reaſon to look on them as *true beleevers*, their *fall* ſhewed them to be *otherwiſe*; and proclaimed them beyond all contradiction, to have been not *ſtarres* but *meteors*;

Stella cadens, non eſt ſtella, Cometa fuit:

and notwithſtanding all their *blazing*, the *ſtink* which they left *behinde* them, ſhewed what *matter* they were made of; charity commanded to judge the beſt of them whiles they *ſhined*; we had no reaſon to retaine our *charity*, when they relinquiſh'd their *faith*; and thereby *ſhewed* that they had at beſt but a *ſhew of faith*. When you tell us, [we but beg the queſtion in this our anſwer;] our anſwer is, this is out of queſtion, notwithſtanding all the poor arguments, wherewith you would ſeem to flouriſh againſt it. As when you ſay,

§. 7. Thirdly, [If our Saviours rule be authentick, *By their fruits ye ſhall know them*; we did not only ſtand bound by the law of charity, but by the law of righteous or diſtinct judgement it ſelf, to judge the perſons we ſpeak of, true believers, whiles they adorned the Goſpel with ſuch fruits of righteouſneſſe, as were mentioned: for our Saviour doth not ſay, *By their fruits ye ſhall* have ground to *conceive* or *conjecture* them ſuch or ſuch, or judge them in charity ſuch or ſuch, but you *ſhall know them*. If then it be poſſible for men, by any ſignes, fruits, works, expreſſions in one kinde or other, to know true believers, which our Saviour in the ſaid rule, and elſewhere, ſeemeth to ſuppoſe to be very poſſible, the perſons we ſpeak of may be known to have been ſuch.]

I anſwer, 1. Our Saviour in theſe words, *By their fruits ye ſhall know them*, ſpeaks not of knowing *true beleevers*, but *true teachers*; now men may be *true teachers*, yet not *true believers*; ſhew others the way to *heaven*, yet themſelves walk to *hell*; many a man hath *preach't well*, yet *lived ill*; been a good *Doctor*, yet a bad *diſciple*; and ſo might many of theſe perſons you ſpeak of have been. *Judas* and *Demas*, I dare ſay, preached nothing worſe, then you or I. To be a true Teacher is a *falſe ſigne* of a *true beleever*.

2. The *fruits* Chriſt ſpeaks of are, not the *works* of theſe *Teachers*, but the *conſequences* of their *doctrines*. Thoſe *doctrines* which lead to *godlineſſe* are *true*, thoſe which open a way to *licentiouſneſſe falſe*. Theſe are the fruits which Chriſt here means.

3, Chriſt doth not ſpeak, by your leave, of knowing *good doctrines* or teachers, by their *good fruits*, ſo much as knowing *evil* ones by their *bad fruits*. *Every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewen down and caſt into the fire; wherefore by their fruits ye ſhall know them.*

The ſumme of all amounts to this, that the *good works* you have ſo prolixly repreſented, are ill *proofes* of the *goodneſſe* of theſe mens *faith*; nor indeed, can we certainly know *any mans faith to be good by his works*, though we may, that *no mans faith is good without good works*; we who ſee only the *outſide* of mens works, are bound in *charity* to think the beſt of them; we are not bound to *aſſure* our ſelves of their *goodneſſe* in [ſtrictneſſe of *judgement*,] as you phraſe it. It is as much as we can do to *know our own hearts*; we leave it to God to judge of others: and for our part, we are bound to hope the *beſt*, where God knowes there is nothing but is naught; He ſees them poiſon'd in the *fountaine*, though we diſcern it not in the *ſtream*: He ſees a *root of bitterneſſe*, where we diſcover nothing but deliciouſneſſe in the fruit. You adde,

§. 8. Fourthly and laſtly, [If that doctrine of Perſeverance, in the comfort whereof men ſo much rejoyce, intangles them with ſuch a neceſſity, for the defence of it, as this; I mean to judge all thoſe to have been hypocrites, or unſound in the faith, who afterwards apoſtatize and decline to prophaneneſſe; it will be found upon a true account, to be a doctrine of no ſuch good accord with their peace and comfort, as is pretended, or as they inconſiderately imagine; for what will it availe me to my peace or comfort, though I be never ſo fully reſolved or perſwaded, that in caſe I

be

be a true beleever, I ſhall never fall away to perdition, if in the mean time I be ſo intangled in my judgement, that I can hardly, if at all, have any ſufficient or clear ground, to judge when, or that I am a true beleever, or be otherwiſe occaſioned, ſtrongly to ſuſpect or doubt of the truth of my faith? Now if I muſt of neceſſity, conclude all theſe to have been hypocrites, or pretenders only unto true faith, who afterwards fall, and riſe no more; I muſt needs hereby miniſter an occaſion to a thouſand feares and jealouſies to my ſelf and my own conſcience, touching the truth and ſoundneſſe of mine own faith, leſt this ſhould be of no better kinde or conſtitution then theirs. And being compaſſed about with ſuch feares and jealouſies as theſe, what great peace or comfort am I capable of, touching my ſalvation? or what is it to me whether true beleevers may fall away or no, when as I lie under the heavy preſſure of ſo many doubts and debates with my ſelf, whether I be a true beleever or no?

The Reply which you ſay we make, ſufficiently anſwers all this: It is to this effect, that albeit we cannot be certain of anothers ſincerity, we may be of our *own*: Know we are *ſincere*, though we too often *ſin*; that we *love God*, though we *leave* him; that we do not *forſake* him, though we *forget* him. To this you draw up an Anſwer, conſiſting of three parts. §. 9.

Firſt [You deny not, but a man may very poſſibly attain to a very ſtrong and potent aſſurance, and that upon grounds every wayes ſufficient, warrantable and good, that his faith is ſound and ſaving, and wherein perſevering he ſhall live.

Secondly, but withal you verily believe, that there is not one believer of an hundred, you may ſay, of many thouſands, who hath ſuch aſſurance of the truth, and ſoundneſſe of his faith; And for this you give two Reaſons. §. 10.

1. Becauſe though the teſtimony of a mans heart, touching his uprightneſſe towards God be comfortable and chearing, yet ſeldome is this comfortableneſſe and cheeringneſſe of it built upon ſuch foundations, as are ſufficient to warrant them; for the teſtimony of a mans conſcience is of no value, unleſſe it be excellently enlightened with the knowledge of the nature, properties and condition of that of which it teſtifieth. And,

2. Be in the actual contemplation, conſideration or remembrance of what it knoweth in this kinde, when it rendereth ſuch teſtimony. Now there are, you queſtion not, many thouſands, who truly beleeve, and whoſe hearts are upright with God, who yet are not to any ſuch degree *inlightened*, about the nature and properties, either of a true faith, or uprightneſſe of heart, but that the teſtimony which their conſciences give concerning theſe, is liable to many diſputes and queſtions, about the certainty and truth of it in the conſciences themſelves which give it, witneſſe their conflicts, with many feares, and ſcruples and doubtful apprehenſions.]

I anſwer, it is enough for us, that ſome (as you confeſſe) may have [ſufficient aſſurance of the ſoundneſſe of their faith,] whether [one of a hundred or a thouſand have it] is not the queſtion: We will grant, there is requiſite [a ſufficient inlightening of the underſtanding, with the knowledge of the nature and properties of ſound faith; and more, an actual conſideration of them; and more then this, that many thouſands who truly believe, have no other teſtimony of their conſciences then what is liable to diſputes and queſtions.]

All you can inferre hence is, *Ergo* it is few mens happineſſe to have this aſſurance; we will yield that too; but the thing under diſpute is *Perſeverance* not *Aſſurance*. Now though we have been content to yield you, that very *few* have this *Aſſurance*, it will not follow, but that *all beleevers* ſhall have *perſeverance*; and I take it this is a comfort to a man, that if he truly beleeve, he *may be aſſured* he ſhall *perſevere*, albeit he may not be aſſured that he truly believes. This *aſſurance*, that *he ſhall perſevere if he truly believe*, is an encouragement to him to be *found in the faith*, and to endeavour to have an *aſſurance of his ſoundneſſe*, and his *feares* and *doubts* will ſet the greater edge on this *indeavour*, and this *indeavour* abate his *feares* and *doubts*; and in Concluſion give him *a comfortable aſſurance*.

Thirdly, You ſay, [The comfortableneſſe, and chearingneſſe of the teſtimony, §. 11.

which any mans conſcience gives, touching the ſoundneſſe of his faith, and the uprightneſſe of his heart towards God, depending mainly and principally, upon the uniforme, regulate, and conſtant tenour of his life and converſation, in wayes of holineſſe; and there being ſo few, even among the Saints themſelves, who are to any competent or conſiderable degree careful, to walk without ſtumblings and ſlippings, and many ſtraines of unworthineſſe; hence it muſt needs follow, that that teſtimony of conſcience, we ſpeak of, will faulter, and be divided in it ſelf; and though that which is comfortable and chearing in it may be predominant, yet the conſciouſneſſe and ſenſe of irregularities in mens wayes, muſt needs detract proportionably from the ſame.]

I anſwer, 1. That it is true, the [comfortable teſtimony of a mans conſcience, depends mainly and principally upon the uniforme, regulate, and conſtant tenor of his life and converſation, in wayes of holineſſe,] but his *ſtumblings* in the way, are no *evidences* againſt this [uniforme, regulate, and conſtant tenour in this way] he may *ſtumble in it*, yet not *ſtray from it*; his *ſtumbling in the way* is not a *loſing of the way*, his *ſtumbling* may chance to ſet him ſomewhat the more forward, and thus he may get ground by his *ſliding*. I grant you each of theſe *ſtumblings* [makes the teſtimony of his conſcience faulter] but when he ariſes again, this teſtimony covers the *fault*, and now his *ariſing* is as *comfortable*, as his *ſtumbling* was *terrible* to him. What he *loſt by his ſtumbling* he *gains* with advantage, in his *ſteadier* and *ſwifter* courſe *after this ſtumbling* which makes him the better *ponder his path*, and take the more heed to his *feet*. In the *nick* of *ſtumbling* we yield a [faultering.] But a [faultering] is not preſently a *falling*; and a falling is not alwayes a *falling all along*; and a falling all along is not a *lying all along*; and a lying all along doth not take him from *riſing againe*. When he is riſen again, this teſtimony of his conſcience returnes to its former comfortableneſſe: in the mean time, what if the [conſciouſneſſe of theſe ſtumblings detract proportionably from the comfortableneſſe of the teſtimony of his conſcience?] We deny not, but this comfortableneſſe admits of many *diminutions*, and theſe *diminutions* occaſion an *augmentation*. The *ſtumblings* make him ſenſible of his *own weakneſſe*; his *riſing*, of *Gods power and favour*; and being riſen, he acknowledgeth *Gods grace* the more, the more he is conſcious of his *own infirmities and corruptions*: Gods grace is wont to be *perfected in weakneſſe*, and to abound moſt where men are moſt convinced, they have moſt *need of it*. An humble walking before God, as it is moſt pleaſing in his eye; ſo it may give the ſureſt teſtimony to our owne hearts. Now an interruption in a fall now and then, makes men to walk in the more conſtant humility; a *humble ſtumbler* hath more cauſe to finde comfort in his wayes, then a *haughty walker*, who though he ſeem not to *ſtumble*, indeed never went *upright*: how many are there, whoſe *uprightneſſe in their walking*, unawares betrayed them to the *pit of confuſion*? *Pride ever goes before a fall*; and God keep me from having my part with ſuch *juſt ones* as *need no repentance*. Shortly, let the [proportion which is detracted from the comfortableneſſe] be what it will, as long as the comfortableneſſe is predominant, we have as much we deſire. We contend not for *dayes* without *nights*; nor for any ſuch *clearneſſe* in any day, as admits no *clouds*; but withal, we ſay the *darkeſt nights* have commonly a *little ſtarre-light*; at leaſt where no ſtarre is to be ſeen, we may have a candle to help us. And which is more, theſe greateſt *detractions from our comfort*, as they are not without ſome little mixture of that which may ſuggeſt *hope*, ſo afterwards they make the comfort ſo much the ſweeter when thoſe detractions are paſt. *Olim hæc meminiſſe*. You adde.

[The credit and authority of that teſtimony, which any mans conſcience gives in unto him, touching the truth and ſoundneſſe of his faith, muſt needs in a very great meaſure depend upon the equal flowings, or iſſuings forth hereof, in wayes and works of righteouſneſſe; becauſe when there is any conſiderable interruption in theſe, that teſtimony will be ſuſpended and put to ſilence for the time, unleſſe the conſcience it ſelf be under the power of ſome deluſion.]

I anſwer, you there fall below what you ſaid before. There the teſtimony of the

cor-

conſcience [depended mainly and principally] here [in ſome *meaſure*, upon the equable flowings and iſſuings forth of faith, in equable wayes and works of righteouſneſſe.] But what, I pray, are theſe [equable flowings?] I wis there is no mans faith which thus [equably flowes.] For, beſides that there are *ebbs*, as well as *floods*, in every man; every *flood* is not *alike*; there are ſome *higher*, ſome *lower* ſprings; and in the *higheſt ſpring*, it is not, I trow, alwayes *full ſea*: for [equable flowings] we know not what you mean by them, much leſſe what by [equable iſſuings forth:] faith may *work* equably when it doth not ſo [*iſſue forth*;] the inward workings of it, are to *God* moſt *acceptable*, and to the *Saints* moſt *comfortable*. They are not *outward* actings ſo much as *inward*, that teſtifie the ſoundneſſe of faith; As an hatred of ſinne, which yet may intangle us; a ſubmitting to the Will of God, a denial of our ſelves: Theſe acts which do not [iſſue forth] have the chief influence upon the comfort of our ſpirits; and ſeale to us the beſt aſſurances of Gods favour, and our own faith. Now theſe may be found [equable] in the *inward* man, where there is a conſiderable *variation* in the *outward* man; that conſcience is [under the power of a ſtrong deluſion, which can ſpeak peace to it ſelf without theſe:] but where theſe are found, though there be ſome ſtumblings and ſlippings as before in *outward* actions, the conſcience is not *deluded*, which ſpeaks comfort to us. And yet who doubts but that the beſt conſcience may be often ſubject to [the power of deluſion?] Alas, we know no man that is priviledged from it. But the conſciences of the Saints, are [under the power of a deluſion] ſo as to finde too *little comfort*, oftner then to be fooled into *groſſer ſinnes*. Their conſcience doth too often dream waking of terrors and dangers; and as long as it looks but *inward* on it ſelf, it ſeldome *injoyes* it ſelf; but when it looks abroad, then it recovers it ſelf, and is refreſhed with the contemplation of *Chriſts righteouſneſſe*, when it is *wearied* with reflecting on *its owne*. Their righteouſneſſe is never looked on with comfort, but as it is covered with Chriſts. It is the flowing of his blood that cheares them, elſe there is ſtill too much of their own fleſh to confound them; His ſufferings is that which *ſupports* them, they would ſink under the *weight*, (ſhall I ſay,) or *lightneſſe* of their own *works*. They know themſelves too *unprofitable ſervants* at beſt, to expect any reward, but for their Lords merits. The teſtimony of their conſciences would be alwayes [ſilent,] were it not for that *blood of ſprinkling*, *which ſpeaks better things then that of* Abel.

You go on, [This is evident from the Scriptures themſelves in many places. *Little children*, ſaith *John*, *let no man deceive you*, *he that doth righteouſneſſe is righteous*. This Caveat, *Let no man deceive you*, plainly intimates, that the conſciences even of Chriſtians and true believers themſelves, may very poſſibly be deceived in their eſtimate of a righteous man, or which is the ſame, of a ſound believer, and judge him to be either the one or the other, who is neither.]

This is chiefly ſpoken concerning a mans judging of himſelf; whereas he addes, *He that doth righteouſneſſe is righteous*; it is to be underſtood emphatically and excluſively; ſo that he, and he only *who doth righteouſneſſe* is to be judged a *righteous* man. Now by *doing righteouſneſſe*, he doth not mean the doing of *ſome righteous* acts now and then, but a conſtant and uniforme practice of righteouſneſſe, humane frailties only excepted, which comes not into this account. Now if no man can, or ought upon Scripture-grounds, to be judged a righteous man, or ſound believer, but only he who doth, or worketh righteouſneſſe upon ſuch termes as theſe: evident it is, that in what degree men fall ſhort of theſe termes, in working righteouſneſſe, the teſtimony of their conſciences, touching the ſoundneſſe of their faith, and uprightneſſe of their hearts towards God, muſt needs faulter and be incumbred with doubts and feares proportionably, unleſſe their conſciences themſelves be miſinformed or hardened.]

I have no exception againſt this; but willingly grant you, that the [conſciences of believers, are ever and anon incumbred with ſuch doubts and feares proportionable] to their *delinquencies*; but as their *delinquencies* notwithſtanding they amend their *faults*, ſo their *doubts* notwithſtanding, they recover their *comfort*; and *repentance*

pentance reſtores them to their former *ſerenity*. Yea, as after their delinquencies they walk the more *carefully*, ſo how much more *carefully* they walk, ſo much more *chearfully* do they walk. Their *delinquencies* draw them to an holy *ſorrow*, this *ſorrow* brings in a holy *joy*. The *Sun-ſhine* is the ſweeter after a *ſtorme*. As we do not affirm, that the Saints lead a perfect and uninterrupted courſe of *righteouſneſſe*, ſo neither do we, that they enjoy ſuch a tenour of *comfort*, but as their righteouſneſſe, though *interrupted*, is not *broken* off, ſo neither is their *comfort*. The *ſeed* both of the one and the other remaines in them in the deadeſt *Winter*; and when the *Spring* advanceth, puts forth new *leaves*, and *flowers*, and *fruit*. We are not for a *conſtancy of comfort*, we are for *grounds* of *comfort*, *conſtantly remainining* in them, though not *conſtantly iſſning out* upon them. Yea, we ſay, that as they *do not ſinne* in ſome ſenſe, ſuch as the Apoſtle means, 1 *John* 3. 9. *Becauſe their ſeed remaineth in them*; ſo they *need not ſorrow* as *men without hope*. They are *caſt down*; they are not *in deſpaire*; their conſciences may tell them, that though they do not conſtantly, ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην, yet neither do they at any time ποιεῖν ἁμαρτίαν; they do but *the evil which they would not*, *Rom.* 7. and ſo long St. *Paul* allowes them to ſay, *they are not they that do it*, but *ſin that dwells in them*; that *in their minde they ſerve the Law of God*, even when *in their fleſh they ſerve the Law of ſinne*: if you pleaſe to remember that of the Apoſtle, 1 *John* 3 9. *They do not commit ſin*, you need not inſiſt ſo emphatically on this, they do not alwayes *do righteouſneſſe*: And as the doing of *ſome righteous acts*, as you ſay, [now and then, doth not denominate a man righteous:] ſo neither doth the *doing ſome unrighteous acts* now and then, denominate him *unrighteous*, I mean in the Goſpel-ſenſe, albeit each *thought* of unrighteouſneſſe doth in that of the *law*. [The conſtant and uniforme practice, is that, as you ſay right, which *gives the name*,] Now as an *unrighteous* man is ſaid to be [conſtant and uniforme] in his practice of *unrighteouſneſſe*, notwithſtanding ſome *fits of righteouſneſs* now and then upon him, ſo may the Saints be ſaid to be [conſtant and uniforme] in their *practice of righteouſneſſe*, notwithſtanding they be now and then ſurprized into *unrighteouſneſſe*, and as an *unrighteous* man doth good by leſſe then *halfes*, with odde aimes and purpoſes, which diſcover his *beſt works* to be rotten, in the ſight of that *God* who ſees his heart, ſo doth a *righteous* man do *unrighteouſneſſe* incompleatly and faintly, and the ſame *God* who ſees his heart, ſees his heart to be more *paſſive* then *active* in ſuch works; and he *himſelf* findes his heart *recoyling* upon him, with ſuch a *regret* upon it, as ſends him to the Throne of grace with *compunction*, when he returnes not without *comfort* at laſt, *bleſſing* God for his *goodneſſe*, as well as *bluſhing* at his own *vileneſſe*; and ſeeing that though there be a *variableneſſe* in *his doing of righteouſneſs*, there is none in the *righteouſneſs* of Chriſt, *no ſhadow of turning in the goodneſſe of God*, *he the Lord changeth not*: and therefore his *Iſraelites*, though they may be Jacobed or ſupplanted, they ſhall not be *conſumed*. Now then, though in caſe of ſuch faultrings in *duty*, there be a faultring in *comfort*, this proves not an *interciſion*, though there be an *interruption*; the heart is *dejected*, elſe were it *deceived*; but it is not *hardened* ſo much as *ſoftened*, by occaſion of ſuch falls. True it is, God lets it be *hardened* for a *time*, but the heart anon growes *ſenſible* of this *hardneſſe*, and cries to God *againſt* it, *Why haſt thou hardened me from thy feare?* Iſa. 62. *hardened me* by *leaving* me to my native *hardneſſe*, and *withdrawing* the influences of that holy Spirit of thine, which alone could *molliſie* it. Thus ſhe takes this *hardneſſe tenderly*, and *bemoaneth* her ſelf, and *beſeecheth* God, to *return* what way him *pleaſeth* beſt, and ſo he *bruiſe* it anew, ſhe cares not how he *beats* it, which makes it even *break it ſelf* with *ſorrowing*, as it did *his Commandments* by *ſinning*. God is graciouſly pleaſed ever and anon to permit ſome *hardening of our ſpirit*, that we may know, what need we have of his *chaſtiſements*; and when he poures in his *balme of grace*, he addes of courſe ſome *oile* of *joy*, which though it firſt *drop* down but in *teares*, afterward *ſtreams* down in an *extaſie* of rejoycing, nor are the very *teares* ſo *ſalt* as *ſweet*, *Lachrymis egeritur dolor*; never is Chriſts *preſence* ſo dear to his *Spouſe*, as after he hath withdrawn himſelf, as it were, upon her unkindneſſe, and vouchſafes to return upon her *relenting*. The *turning* of his *back* ſets the more value on the *kiſſes* of his mouth. One

Stroke

ſtroke on her *cheek*, makes abundant amends for many a *blow* on her *ſides*. You proceed.

[Therefore what doctrine ſoever, occaſioneth men to queſtion the ſufficiency of their obedience, or righteous walking, for rendring the teſtimony of their conſciences, touching the ſoundneſſe of their faith, valid and worthy belief, can be of no ſuch lovely or deſirable conſequence, for their comfort and peace, and conſequently the doctrine of Perſeverance, cannot in a righteous judgement be adjudged ſuch.]

And 1. What doctrine, I pray, is that, which doth not [occaſion men to queſtion the ſufficiency of their obedience or righteous walkings?] I trow you will preach none ſuch, no not at *Coleman*-ſtreet; and if there be no good doctrine, but teacheth men to [queſtion,] yea, to deny [the ſufficiency of their obedience and righteous walkings] what reaſon have you to finde fault with *ours* as to this?

2. What doctrine is that, which doth not [occaſion men upon a default in their obedience and righteous walkings] to look upon their conſciences, as giving teſtimony *againſt them*? I hope it is no fault in *our* doctrine, that it doth *thus too*.

3. Yet doth not our doctrine occaſion men to queſtion hereupon the *truth*, albeit it do the *ſoundneſſe* of their faith. It doth the *ſoundneſſe* of their faith, as *ſoundneſſe* ſignifies *perfection*, not as it ſignifies *ſincerity*, it makes the teſtimony of the conſcience to be unworthy belief, if it witneſſe for its *fulneſſe*, not if for its *truth*.

4. This [queſtioning of the teſtimony of the conſcience, touching the ſoundneſſe of faith] doth not ariſe from the *doctrine of Perſeverance*, but from *another doctrine*, which *we* teach, (and I truſt *you* teach the ſame) *with* that of Perſeverance. Our *doctrine of Perſeverance* doth not teach this of it *ſelf*.

5. Doth your doctrine of Apoſtaſie help to mend the matter in this particular? upon the whole I conclude, Your *Concluſion* is wholly beſide the *Cuſhion*: The *doctrine of Perſeverance* is not to be blamed as *uncomfortable*; becauſe *another* doctrine which we preach as well as it, teaches men to beware how they *abuſe themſelves with deceitful comforts*. You adde your Reaſon,

[Becauſe (as hath been already argued) it, *i. e.* the doctrine of Perſevetance, ſtill neceſſitateth men to give ſentence againſt a better, and more uniforme righteouſneſſe then their own, I mean the practical righteouſneſſe of many, who after apoſtatized without returning, as being invalid and inſufficient, to evince thoſe to have been true believers, in whom it was found. And if I ſtand bound in conſcience to judge thoſe to have been Hypocrites and Pretenders only to a true faith, and not true believers indeed, whoſe righteouſneſſe and frnitfulneſſe of converſation, by many degrees exceeded mine; am I not ſtrongly hereby occaſioned, yea ingaged, to queſtion the truth and ſoundneſſe of mine own faith? eſpecially conſidering as hath been ſaid, that the evidence of the truth, and reality of every mans faith, depends ſo much upon the fruitfulneſſe and operativeneſſe of it, in wayes and works of righteouſneſſe.]

I anſwer, 1. That that phraſe of [*practical righteouſneſſe*] is an impertinent one, no *righteouſneſſe of mans* being other. 2. That this doctrine of Perſeverance, puts us indeed, upon giving [ſentence againſt the righteouſneſſe of ſuch as apoſtatized, and never returned] but it followes not, that therefore againſt a [better righteouſneſſe then our own,] we know *their righteouſneſſe* to have been *falſe*, becauſe it *faded* and *periſhed*. Though it were more *ſpecious*, it was not ſo *ſound* as *ours*: We may know the *ſincerity* of our *owne hearts* to be *more*, though the *ſplendor* of our *works* be *leſſe*. A *comet* may blaze more then a *ſtarre*, yet a *ſtarre* which ſeems *lightleſſe* is a *ſtarre*, whereas a *comet* which out-ſhines it is *none*.

3. We do not [give ſentence upon the better righteouſneſſe (as you call it) of ſuch as after apoſtatized, and never returned] we are not aſſured that any never returned, but *ſuch* as *God* himſelf hath ſentenced as *hypocrites*, while they were judged by men to be moſt *righteous*: for *others* we know not, but they *might return*, though we know not that they *did*. We leave them to the *Lords day*; but for *our*

ſelves, we may take a better proſpect of *our own*, then *others* righteouſneſſe. We can ſee the *root* of *ours*, we do not that of *other mens*; the *fruit* may be *faire* to the *eye*, yet *rotten* at the *core*; *taſte* well in the *outward* acts, yet be *worme-eaten* in the *inner*: when we know others moſt *intus*, we do it but in *cute*; but for our *ſelves* we may take an account of our thoughts and intentions, wiſhes and deſires, and know that the poſture of our *hearts* is right, even when our *feet* go awry; know that we *believe* even when we need that God help our *unbelief*. We do not condemn any whom God hath not condemned. We are more ſolicitous to ſue out our *own pardon*, then to paſſe *ſentence* on *others*; our conſcience is a witneſſe to our *ſelves* of our *own righteouſneſſe*, who made it a *Judge* of *other* mens? Yea,

4. Our doctrine of Perſeverance neceſſitateth us, to hope *the beſt of men that apoſtatize*, if we had ever cauſe to hope *well of them*; and our charity, which bid us hope they *were ſincere before* their Apoſtaſie, bids us hope they will *return after it*; and albeit we ſee *more* of their *Apoſtaſie* then their *ſincerity*, yet we hope God will work them to return the *better* from their Apoſtaſie; and if we ſee *no evidence* for their return, yet neither have we evidence againſt it, we leave this as a *non liquet*. And whereas you ſay [we are bound to give ſentence againſt their righteouſneſſe, before their Apoſtaſie,] we reply, we have nothing to ſay, but they may be *more righteous after it*; *return* with teares which cannot be expreſſed; *return* though *ſecretly*, and be *accepted*, notwithſtanding their *open* Apoſtaſie, ſo farre are we from paſſing ſuch [ſentence] as you pretend, that we put off all with an *Ignoramus*. I ſhall now take my farewel of this Section, having firſt whiſpered in your eare, that you ſpeak not like the great Maſter of accurateneſſe, when you conclude it with this, [that the evidence of the reality of mens faith, depends upon the fruitfulneſſe and operativeneſſe of it, in wayes and works of righteouſneſſe.] Your [operativeneſſe] ſounds not handſomely after [fruitfulneſſe.] There may be [operativeneſs] yet no [fruitfulneſſe.] There cannot be [fruitfulneſſe,] but there muſt needs be [operativeneſſe,] Such a Doctor as you ſhould have put your words in a better order; the *firſt* ſhould have been *laſt*, the laſt firſt.

§. 12. You give us the ſumme of all you have ſaid, thus, [The Premiſſes duly conſidered, that doctrine of Perſeverance, over which the generality of Profeſſors ſo impotently rejoyce, as being of ſo deſirable and rich a compliance with their ſpiritual comfort and peace, muſt needs appear to be a doctrine of no ſuch import or accommodation to them, but rather very apt and likely to intice them into a boldneſſe and venturouſneſſe in ſinning, and conſequently muſt needs diſpoſe them to Apoſtaſie and declining; yea, and fill their conſciences, many times with dread and horrour, and very frequently with great jealouſies, inextricable queſtions and diſputes about the truth and ſoundneſſe of their faith.]

I anſwer, 1. The [generality of Profeſſors] beare a greater name with me, then reverend Mr. *Goodwin*, and all the members of his Church at *Coleman*-ſtreet; nor can I think ought the better of their worthy Paſtor, for accuſing the [generality of Profeſſors, of an impotent rejoycing over a thing of nought;] yea worſe; either the [generality of Profeſſors] are *ſorry* men, in this their *rejoycing*; *weak* men in this their *impotent rejoycing*, or Maſter *Goodwin* is fallen into the miſchief of being *over-wiſe*.

2. I have ſufficiently cleared this doctrine, from what you injuriouſly charge it with, an [aptneſſe to entice the Saints to a boldneſſe and venturouſneſſe in ſinning:] You only ſhew your [boldneſſe and venturouſneſſe] in ſaying it. I have likewiſe anſwered what you have alledged, to prove it guilty of [diſpoſing the Saints to Apoſtaſie,] and ſhewed it to be an effectual meanes to preſerve them from declining. And whereas you ſay [it many times fills their conſciences with dread and horrour, &c.] I have ſhewed the emptineſſe of your diſcourſe to that purpoſe; and now ſhall only minde you, that after [dread and horrour] you do not ſpeak like your ſelf, to talk of [jealouſies and queſtions.] Theſe *lighter* words are ill ſeated in the *loweſt* place, and ſhew you need not have too *high* a conceit of the exactneſſe of your expreſſions. But be pleaſed to go on,

[Yea

[Yea, but will the friends of the ſaid doctrine it is like, ſtill ſay, We finde it very ſweet and comfortable to us, whereas the contrary doctrine which tells us of a poſſibility of our final Apoſtaſie, is very ſad, and of diſcouragement, &c. To theſe things and all that can be pretended in this kinde. You anſwer] after your faſhion.

[And 1. Suppoſe this doctrine were never ſo comfortable, yet this would be no argument of the truth or goodneſſe of it, unleſſe the comfortableneſſe of it be found in due conſiſtence with the wiſdom and righteouſneſſe of God.]

True, but ſhall we think the [generality of Profeſſors,] finde ſo much comfort in what is [inconſiſtent with the wiſdom and righteouſneſſe of God?] they allow not themſelves to [rejoyce ſo impotently] in any ſuch *miſerable comforts*; or have you proved this doctrine to be [inconſiſtent with the wiſdom and righteouſneſſe of God? you neither have nor will till dooomeſday. Well, but [it were eaſie to invent twenty doctrines, every whit as comfortable, yea much more comfortable, as this, in reſpect of the natures and imports of them, which yet will be found notoriouſly defective in point of truth, becauſe they hold not any regular proportion with thoſe attributes of God.] It is twenty to one, not one of the doctrines you inſtance in, is any way more comfortable, yea, any thing at all comfortable to the Saints, any of them, much leſſe to the generality of them. As for example, ſay you [ſuch doctrines as theſe, 1. All men without exception ſhall be ſaved, whether they believe or no? 2. No man ſhall be puniſhed for any ſin whatſoever, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come. 3. Men are as much approved of by God, in the committing of the greateſt ſin, as in the performance of the greateſt duty. Such doctrines (you ſay) as theſe, are [much more ſweet and comfortable, in reſpect of their frame, conſtitution and import, then that which affirmes a neceſſity of the Saints perſeverance,] *ais, nego*, and I appeal to all the Saints all the world over, whether either of theſe doctrines have any thing comfortable to them? what comfort they would bring to *Wicked wretches* is not the queſtion; you are to ſpeak of their comfortableneſſe to the *Saints*, or you ſpeak miſerably *non ad idem*. Now let us particularly examine theſe [comfortable doctrines.] 1. That [all men ſhall be ſaved, whether they believe or no?] This is ſo farre from being comfortable to the Saints, that it takes off all the comfort of their *faith* and *Saintſhip*, for if they ſhall be ſaved *without them*, they have no cauſe at all to comfort themſelves *in them*; eſpecially conſidering how *many comforts* their *faith* and *Saintſhip* deprives them of on earth, and according to this comfortable doctrine, will bring them nothing the ſooner to the joyes of *heaven*; they have little cauſe to comfort themſelves in that which puts them on plucking out their *right eyes*, and cutting off their *right hands*, when as they might have done better on earth, and gone all as well to *heaven*, with *both eyes and both hands*, yea, both *eyes full of all luſts*, and both *hands as full of all wicked pleaſures, profits and preferments*: I dare ſay, you loſe ſomewhat of your credit at *Coleman-ſtreet*, for ſpeaking ſo confidently of the *comfort* of this *firſt* doctrine, that they will all ſay, *Magiſter hic non tenetur*. Yet is this I confeſſe a *comfortable* doctrine to *me*, in the ſenſe which ſome body once ſaid, one of our great Doctors at Court, preach't a very *comfortable Sermon*; that was ſuch a Sermon, as no ſorry Countrey-Curate, but might hope to make as good, and accordingly to be qualified to be Chaplain in ordinary in good time; to be a Reverend Deane with his band ſtarch't clean, *which he handles more then his Text*. Thus is your firſt doctrine ſuch a *comfortable* one, as that it aſſures me, I ſhall have little *trouble* to ſhew the *uncomfortableneſſe* of thoſe that follow; juſt ſuch is the *foreman* that ſpeaks never a word to the purpoſe.

The ſecond is, [no man ſhall be puniſhed for any ſinne whatſoever, neither in this world nor in that which is to come.] This is I think as *uncomfortable* to all the Saints, as any you could have eaſily thought of; for if [no man ſhall be puniſhed for any ſinne, neither in this world, nor that to come,] then, what *comfort* have the *poor Saints* here beneath, that God will bid them *ariſe and threſh*? the comfort of this doctrine is meer chaffe. Nay, 2. What comfort have the *bleſſed Saints above*, that

ſay, *How long Lord, holy and true, till thou avenge our blood on thoſe that dwell on the earth?* This is ſuch a *comfortable* doctrine, as indeed bids thoſe ſoules *hold their peace*, for they never get any thing by all their *crying*, nor ſhall their enemies be puniſhed any thing the ſooner for it. They had as good be ſtill and ſave their breath. 3. This doctrine would be of no comfort at all, though it were preached in *hell*; for the damned there would give it the *lie*, and ſay it were worſe then any *doctrine of devils*. What is become now of this [comfortable doctrine] which will not be owned for ſuch in earth, heaven or hell? yet ſtill I profeſſe to finde ſome *comfort* in it, and to be put in very good hopes that I ſhall be put to no intolerable *pain*, in examining what remains of this formidable diſcourſe; but ſhall meet with as little *perplexity* in moſt of it, as any can do *comfort* in this ſweet doctrine.

The third, that [men are as much approved of by God, in committing the greateſt ſinne, as in performing the greateſt duty,] is all as comfortable as the former; *tam, quàm*; a ſingular comfort doubtleſſe to the poor Saints, that God approves them no more when they *pray*, then when they *play*; no more when they *weep for their ſins*, then if they *laughed at them*, and *vaunted* of them; no more when they *faſt*, then if they *drunk with the drunken*; yea, *drunk blood in bowles*. Here is comfort for the nonce, yea [more comfort (ſaith learned Mr. *Goodwin*) in theſe doctrines, then in that which affirmes the neceſſity of the Saints perſeverance,] perhaps he couch't a myſterie in that, that a [neceſſity of perſeverance,] lying upon the Saints, if they expect heaven, it were more comfortable to them to be ſet at the liberty of ſinning in all kindes, which this dear doctrine allows them, then to be tied up to this foure kinde of neceſſity. But even this is as true as the reſt, that is as falſe as the devil ever ſpake word, and it betrayes very much your *ſpirit*, that could finde comfort in theſe doctrines if they were *true*. The Saints rejoyce in doing their *duty*, nor are the Commandments *grievous* to them: they finde the doing their *duty* as their *meat and drink*, every ſinne as *gall and wormwood*, and *feare* the *ſin* as well as the *ſuffering*: Out upon *utinam liceret*,

Quod quia non licuit non volet illa volet.

But now, if we conſtrue this [neceſſity of Perſeverance] for a certainty of their perſeverance in faith and obedience, through the grace of God, which muſt be the ſenſe of it, or it is as good as non-ſenſe, then how muſt Mr. *Goodwin* trouble his beſt wits to prove thoſe other doctrines, [all as comfortable, nay much more comfortable then this to the Saints?] we may very well allow him a competent time for ſo conſiderable a work; and ſo for this time no more of it. Only thus, if theſe doctrines be comfortable to any Saints, it is but to the Saint Ranter, Saint Plunderer, Saint Church-robber, Saint Cut-throat, Saint Cheater, Saint Pettifogger, and the reſt of thoſe black Saints newly canonized, whom I leave to *comfort themſelves* with theſe and the like doctrines, while they *treaſure up wrath againſt the day of wrath*. The Saints of God muſt needs be extreamly afflicted, in hearing you ſay [thoſe doctrines would be in any way comfortable to them,] Alas, Sir, they would not for all the world they ſhould be true: but that they ſhould be put in the ſcales, with the doctrine of the neceſſity of the Saints perſeverance, and that it ſhould be braved out [that they over-balance it in point of comfortableneſſe.] This is that which is able to ſet an edge upon the patience of a *Job*, and make him vent himſelf at leaſt with this; *Thou talkeſt like one of the fooliſh women*, as fit only for *Billingsgate*, not for *Colemanſtreet*. How would the holy hearts of all the good men that are to be found in *Chriſtendome*, whether they be for the doctrine of perſeverance or againſt it, beſides one Mr. *Goodwin*, abhorre and abominate ſo abſurd and odious a compariſon? nothing will go for ſatisfaction for this irreparable injury, but that he who drivelled thus with his pen, lick it up with his tongue, and vow to have henceforward no more communion with *Rabſhakeh*. Well, let me ſee next what a cover you have for this diſh of oyſters. [But as thoſe doctrines with their fellowes, are not to be commended nor entertained for their ſweetneſſe and comfortableneſſe ſake, (it

were

were a wonder they ſhould) having no approbation or countenance from God in his Word, ſo neither is the common doctrine of perſeverance at all to be regarded, for any thing of like accommodation, I mean, for any thing ſweet or comfortable in it, unleſſe the ſtamp of divine authority could be ſhewed upon it, which by no light yet extant, is to be ſeen.]

Why then, it ſeems the [generality of Profeſſors,] are all in the *dark*, and only dream waking of an *ignis fatuus*: but we ſhall finde light enough for this doctrine of perſeverance in the proceſſe, notwithſtanding all the *darkneſſe* you would caſt upon it; and in the mean time I ſhall ſay but this, that this one Text, *And he ſhall preſerve me from every evil work unto his heavenly Kingdome* 2 Tim. 4. is better then all the *new light* this age hath diſcovered, or you are like to give us with all your *dark lanthornes*. Come we now to the

Second part of your Anſwer, [Though doctrines, and other means of ſpiritual comfort are very deſirable, and earneſtly to be purſued and contended for, when they are regular and lawful, yet as we muſt be content to be at the allowance of our heavenly Father, for the accommodations and comforts of this preſent life, ſo ought we no leſſe to reſt ſatisfied with ſuch grounds and meanes for our ſpiritual conſolation, as God hath judged meet for us, and hath himſelf adminiſtred unto us in his Word, and not ſtraine our phantaſies or apprehenſions, to mould ſuch notions and doctrines, as we our ſelves conceit to be commodious and ſerviceable to us, in ſuch a way. And as it is an high reproach unto the gracious and bountiful Providence of God, for men to have recourſe unto the devil, and any unclean Arts of his, for their temporal ſupplies in any kinde; ſo is it not leſſe, if not rather much more diſhonourable unto him, when men ſhall make themſelves beholding to a *ſpirit of errour*, for the ſupports or ſupplies of their *inner man*.]

I anſwer, 1, That all this is very true, but truly very impertinent. We ſay, and are ready to prove it, that this doctrine of perſeverance is ſuch, as the Saints have learned from God himſelf out of his Word, and otherwiſe had an Angel from heaven preach't it to us, we ſhould not have believed it. It ſhewes ſo much of the *goodneſſe of God*, as ſurmounts all the thoughts of *man*: *Lord, what is man that thou thus viſiteſt him, or the Son of man that thou ſo remembreſt him*, and ingageſt thy own *power* to preſerve our poor ſoules through *faith to ſalvation?* no Spirit but thine own, could have made this *probable*, much leſſe *aſſured* it unto us.

2. That as it is [a reproach to the gracious and bountiful Providence of God, for men to have recourſe to the devil and his unclean Arts for ſupplies, whether for the outward or inward man,] ſo is it no leſſe diſhonourable to it, to *reject* the *ſupplies* which God is pleaſed to give us for either, upon any ſuggeſtions whatſoever, I ſay, not of the *devil*, but an *Angel from Heaven*. Now God having given us this rich ſupply, the doctrine of Perſeverance, in his Word, (as ſhall be ſhewed,) we dare not contradict it, or not receive it, leſt we be found *fighting againſt Gods honour*, as much as our *own happineſſe*. You think, it ſeems, it would be a *diſhonour* to *God*, and *injury* to *us*, if he ſhould intrench upon the liberty of our wills, and keep us from *periſhing at our pleaſure*. We ſay, God doth this, ſo as he *hurts* not our *wills*, though he *ſaves* our *ſouls* by it.

3. That this which you alledge of our being [to reſt content with ſuch notions and doctrines as God hath been pleaſed to deliver us in his Word, and not to mould new by our phantaſies, for our better accommodation,] would have been remembred by you, when you diſcourſed of the [equal intentions of God to ſave all men, ſuch as periſh as well as ſuch as are ſaved, and his indifferent affections towards them.] This gives ſome comfort to *ſundry men*, but it is but a doctrine framed in mens fancies, not learned out of Gods Oracles. What you object againſt our doctrine of Perſeverance, we may better charge on yours, of Gods indifferent or equal love to all the ſonnes of men. So that this is ſuch a notion, as we can as eaſily and more juſtly produce *againſt you*, then you *againſt us*, and ſo let it paſſe as herbe *John* in your porridge-pot, which gets no ſavour at all by it. But, ſay you,

Thirdly, [No ſuch notion or doctrine, which is only comfortable, and betiding

peace unto the fleſh, or the corrupt, baſe and ſenſual part of a man, ought to be eſteemed, eſpecially by the Saints, ſo much as comfortable, ſimply and indeed, or any means of peace, truly ſo called, but ſhould rather be looked upon as prejudicial unto their intereſt in this kinde; for that which is proper to ſtrengthen the hand of the fleſh, can very hardly, if at all, be ſerviceable unto the Spirit, in the things of the peace and comfort thereof. Now that the doctrine of Perſeverance is a grand Benefactreſſe to the fleſh, or full fountaine of joy and gladneſſe to it, hath been ſufficiently proved in this chapter already.]

I reply, that as you ſay [you have ſufficiently proved,] ſo I have as ſufficiently anſwered your charge already in this chapter, ſo that here is *nihil dictum quod non dictum priùs*, and it hath been ſhewed to be only *maledictum*, a ſhameleſſe ſlander. Well, but you adde [this brief demonſtration further?

[It muſt needs be a doctrine, ſpeaking to the heart of the fleſh, becauſe it adminiſtreth a certain hope unto it, that it ſhall however eſcape the wrath and vengeance which is to come; yea, though it diſporteth it ſelf in all manner of looſeneſſe and licentiouſneſſe in the mean time; for this is the Spirit that ſpeaks in that doctrine.]

I anſwer, the [Spirit of our doctrine breatheth] nothing at all to this purpoſe; it tells the fleſh, that if it [diſport it ſelf in any manner of looſeneſſe] without repentance, it ſhall be *tormented* with fire and brimſtone to all eternity; and if he whoſe *fleſh* takes this *liberty*, be one of the *elect*, this diſporting ſhall be brought to end in *wailing* and *mourning* as for an *only ſonne*, before he ſhall be admitted to ſee the *face of God* among his *children*; that he ſhall ſuffer an *hell* before he come to *Heaven*; that all his [*looſeneſſe*] ſhall be tied up in a greater *ſtrictneſſe*; that all his [*licentiouſneſſe*] ſhall be chaſtiſed with *ſeverity*; what *ſorrow*, what *zeal*, what *indignation*? 2 Cor. 7. that no *ſport* can be worth ſo much *ſorrow*, as it will coſt him in the day of the *bitterneſſe of his ſoule*, that God will *viſit his iniquities with ſtripes, and his ſinne with ſcourges*; and he ſhall *acknowledge* this to be a *mercy* too, that God deales with him as a *ſonne* in it, and that without ſuch *correction* he were but a *baſtard*; This is a ſorry [ſpeaking to the heart of the fleſh] to tell it the *heart* ſhall be broken for every *evil word*, and that it ſhall finde it *clothed with death*; Shortly, that each ſinful *pleaſure* ſhall ſtand him in more *pains*, and ſuch as that thoſe of *death* it ſelf are not more inſufferable; *A wounded ſpirit who can bear?* Every prick at the heart ſhall put him to *ſtrong cries and teares*, in the day of his humiliation, when God ſhall make him *poſſeſſe the iniquities of his youth*. Who is he that can be encouraged, to let his [fleſh diſport it ſelf] upon ſuch termes? Having ſhewed how it befriends the *fleſh*, you proceed and adde,

[That it is no wayes comforting or ſtrengthening to the *Spirit*, or ſpiritual and regenerate part of a man, but rather fulſome unto it, is evident from hence, becauſe a man, ſo farre as he is regenerate or ſpiritual, deſires not, wiſheth not heaven or ſalvation it ſelf, but only in the wayes of holineſſe and of honour, nor would he purchaſe a diſpenſation, though it were offered unto him, with the leaſt haire of his head, to take his fill in the pleaſures of ſinne without danger; nay, if an Angel from Heaven ſhould come and offer ſuch a diſpenſation, it would be as an unclean and accurſed offer unto him.]

Right; but [the doctrine of perſeverance preſumes not to make any ſuch offer of a licence to ſinning without danger] all it ſaith is but this, that if we *ſin*, we ſhall be brought by the good hand of God, to a *hearty ſorrow* for it; and that God will *break us off* from our ſinnes, ſo as to break our very *hearts* for them; It gives no [diſpenſation to ſin,] but it only gives *aſſurance of ſorrow for ſinne*. Well on,

[The holy Angels becauſe they have no fleſh, no corruption in them, though they be mutable, as all creatures whatſoever, by the unavoidable law of their Creation are, value not their happineſſe, or their ſecurity in their ſtandings, at the leaſt mite the leſſe, becauſe they have no liberty of ſinning without danger; nor would they account ſuch a liberty any priviledge or comfort to them at all, if they had it. But that they

are

are capable, or in a poſſibility of ſinning, as well as men regenerate, though not in ſo near a capacity; we ſhall, I conceive, have opportunity to demonſtrate, in the ſequel of the diſcourſe. Now a man regenerate, take him ſo farre as he is ſpiritual and borne of God, valueth opportunities of ſinning no more then an Angel, nor deſireth continuance in the love and favour of God, upon any other termes or conditions then ſuch, in which the Lord Chriſt himſelf, as it ſeems, enjoyed it. *If ye keep my Commandments, ye ſhall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Fathers Commandments, and abide in his love,* John 15. 10. So then, evident it is, that the new man taketh no pleaſure, rejoyceth not in any ſuch doctrine, which enſures, either perſeverance in faith, or continuance in the love and favour of God to it, upon any other termes, then of walking holily and humbly with him. And upon theſe termes, the doctrine, which teacheth a poſſibility of the Saints declining, enſureth both the ſaid glorious accommodations, with as high an hand of ſecurity, as it.]

I had almoſt asked, *Quid hoc ad Rhombum?* but ſure we had need of the Rhumbes of the Compaſſe, that we may the better follow you in this dictate, whoſe way is like *that of a ſhip in the ſea.* yet I will try to trace it, the beſt I can; and that I may do it ſomewhat the better, I will be content to be at the paines of analyzing it, thongh as for method, I may ſay of it, as one did once in *Oxford,* of that of an *Eaſter*-Sermon, *Reſurrexit, non eſt hîc.*

1. You tell us, [the holy Angels have no fleſh no corruption in them,] True. 2. That [yet they are mutable, as all creatures are;] True too; if you mean ſo *mutable,* as from being in a *good* eſtate to be brought to ſomewhat a *better*: doubtleſſe they have not received *all the knowledge,* nor *all the glory* they are capable of. Yea ſecondly, and in their own *nature* they are *dependent,* as for their very *being,* from the preſerving influence of God; which (he in his *nature* being *free,* and not *neceſſitated* otherwiſe, then by the *counſel or pleaſure of his will,* to continue,) muſt needs return to nothing, if he ſhould not have pleaſed to continue it. So that in *nature* there is no *impoſſibility* of their being changed from their glorious eſtate to juſt nothing. But 3. You adde [they are not only mutable thus, but mutable ſo as they are capable, or in a poſſibility of ſinning, as well as men regenerate, though not in ſo near a capacity, and this you hope to demonſtrate in the ſequel of this Diſcourſe] This is fit to be a little better thought on. Now then, though I might have ſaid, the holy Angels in regard of their *nature,* were *once* as capable of ſinning, as thoſe that fell; yet Mr. *Goodwin* ſhould not be too forward to ſay, they are *capable of ſinning now*; as who in the 18. *chap.* of this book *Sect.* 18. ſheweth moſt learnedly, out of the *Schoolmen,* that [the will of the Angels is naturally immutable, from whatever it hath once pitched on] and aſſigneth this for one reaſon, why the evil Angels ſinne was the greater, and ſo accordingly the good Angels holineſſe. But 2. How doth Mr. *Goodwin* ſhew the [holy Angels to be capable of ſinning, though not in ſo near a capacity as men regenerate?] *ipſe dixit.* Well, if this be ſo, we may well enough allow him to diſpute againſt the perſeverance of the Saints on earth, who hath what to ſay, concerning a poſſibility of the Apoſtaſie of the Angels in heaven. If *they* may fall, for ought we know, from *heaven to hell*; (for Mr. *Goodwin* [proves,] that is, aſſerts them in a [capacity of ſinning, though not ſo near a capacity as men regenerate]) we have little cauſe to deny that *we* may fall from *earth to hell. We* are in a [nearer capacity of falling] and hell is nearer to earth then to heaven, according to the doctrine commonly received; what new diſcoveries Mr. *Goodwin* may make to the contrary, we know not; in the mean time, this of the holy Angels [being in a capacity of ſinning, though not in ſo near a capacity as men regenerate,] is a doctrine that may make *regenerate men* the leſſe aſhamed for their *ſinning*; for *ſuperbè nimis mortalitatem dedignatur, qui peccare erubeſcit.* But withal, it may make the *glorified Saints* ſomewhat *afraid* of *falling*; for if the *holy Angels* be in a capacity of ſinning, doubtleſſe the *bleſſed Saints,* who are at beſt but *like the Angels in heaven,* are in a like capacity of ſinning; yea, and as the [Angels in heaven are in a capacity of ſinning, though not altogether ſo near a capacity as regenerate men,] ſo the *glorified Saints* are in a *nearer* capacity of ſinning then the *Angels in heaven,* and

have

have ſomwhat the more cauſe to be *afraid of themſelves*. This is a moſt preciouſly comfortable aſſertion. What follows? Why, ſaith M. *Goodwin*, 4. [The holy Angels value not their happineſs, or their ſecurity in their ſtandings, at the leaſt mite the leſſe, becauſe they have no liberty of ſinning without danger.] Here then again, 1. He grants them that they have [a liberty of ſinning, *i.e.* a capacity of ſinning through the liberty of their wills,] though they be [naturally inflexible from the point where they have once ſetled.] *chap.* 18. *ſect.* 18. But 2. He denies them [a liberty of ſinning without danger.] 3. He implies a danger hanging over or under them, anſwerable to their capacity of ſinning, which is doubtleſſe *tam quàm*, t'one as t'other. 4. He ſaith moſt gravely, [they value their happineſſe or their ſecurity in their ſtanding, not a mite the leſſe, becauſe they have no liberty of ſinning without danger:] But ſurely they had reaſon to value it *much* the *leſſe*, if by the liberty of their will they were in *danger*, *near* or *further* off, ſo it were *danger* of *ſinning*. 5. He tells us [the Angels would not account ſuch liberty, that is, of ſinning without danger, any priviledge or comfort to them if they had it.] I dare truſt him; And in what he ſaith, 6. That [a man regenerate, ſo farre as he is ſpiritual, valueth opportunities of ſinning no more then an Angel;] God be praiſed for his *unſpeakable gift*. It is ſo through the gracious work of his bleſſed Spirit. But what do I hear in the ſeventh place, [Nor doth he, *viz.* the regenerate man, take pleaſure, rejoyceth not in any doctrine which enſures either perſeverance in faith, or continuance in the love and favour of God, upon any other termes or conditions, then ſuch as the Lord Chriſt himſelf, as it ſeems, enjoyed it: *If ye keep my Commandments, ye ſhall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Fathers Commandments, and abide in his love.*] It is worth the while to weigh this, Whether [the regenerate man deſire the continuance and favour of God, upon no other termes then Chriſt enjoyed it?] For 1. If [the regenerate man deſire the continuance of the love and fauour of God, upon no other termes then Chriſt enjoyed it,] then he deſires it only upon a *perfect obedience*, without the mixture of the *leaſt ſinne*; I beleeve no regenerate man, but would tremble, to heare he ſhould enjoy continuance in the love and favour of God, only upon ſuch termes; as being conſcious to himſelf of his daily, yea hourely, yea minutely faultrings, in one kinde or other. If he deſires not continuance of Gods love and favour to him, but upon his continuance in entire and abſolute obedience, he deſires no continuance of it at all, but that the love and favour of God ſhould be loſt as ſoon as obtained. 2. If he doth [not deſire the continuance of it upon other termes then theſe,] he deſires the continuance of Gods love upon *worſe* termes by farre, then God *promiſed* it to him. God hath promiſed, that he *will not take his mercy from his children*, though ſometimes they *keep not his Commandments*; and that though he *viſit their iniquities with his rods, and their ſins with ſcourges, yet his mercy will he not take from them, nor ſuffer his truth to faile*. If [a regenerate man deſire the continuance of Gods love and favour to him, only upon ſuch termes as Chriſt enjoyed it] He is well pleaſed, it ſeems, to forfeit the love and favour of God, in caſes wherein God hath ingaged himſelf *not to take it from him*. 3. If [a regenerate man deſire the continuance of Gods love and favour, but upon ſuch termes, as Chriſt enjoyed it,] then he deſires it not upon ſuch termes as Chriſt hath *purchaſed it* for him: for Chriſt hath *purchaſed* the continuance of Gods love and favour to us, ſo as to be *merciful to our ſins, and blot out our tranſgreſſions, and his blood is the propitiation of them all*: but [a regenerate man, deſiring the continuance of Gods love, only upon ſuch termes as Chriſt himſelf enjoyed it] deſires it not, but upon an *abſolute righteouſneſſe*, which needs as no *repentance* on his *own* part, ſo no *pardon* on *Gods*, no *purchaſe of pardon on Chriſts part*. 4. If [a regenerate man deſire the continuance of the love and favour of God, but upon ſuch terms as Chriſt enjoyed it] then he deſires it not, upon ſuch termes as Chriſt *deſires now in heaven*, that we ſhould enjoy it, for he is *gone into heaven to appear in the preſence of God for us, and lives for ever to make interceſſion for us*, that is, *for our ſins and failings*; but a regenerate man, it ſeems, ſcornes to enjoy the love and favour of God upon ſuch termes as theſe; and when ever he failes, is content Chriſt ſhould forbear this his *interceſſion* and

medi-

mediation for him, ſo then I believe few Regenerate men finde in themſelves ſuch deſires as this [not to enjoy the love and favour of God, but upon ſuch termes as Chriſt enjoyed it.] Why? but let us ſee, 2. Whether he [deſire perſeverance in faith upon ſuch terms, as Chriſt enjoyed it?] what means this, as Chriſt enjoyed *perſeverance* in *faith*, or *continuance in the love and favour of God*?

1. If as Chriſt enjoyed perſeverance in *faith*, ſurely Chriſt had no *ſuch faith*, as a Regenerate man, to perſevere in, unleſſe Chriſt believed *in himſelfe*, and believed in himſelfe for *pardon of ſin*, *reconciliation* to God, &c. but all this is too wilde to be dreamed of by a man that is in health, and went ſober to bed; *Ergo* the meaning cannot be, a Regenerate man deſires perſeverance in *faith* [upon no other termes then Chriſt enjoyed it *viz.*] perſeverance in *faith*. But let us ſee,

2. Whether it be that a Regenerate man deſire *perſeverance in faith* upon no other termes then ſuch, as whereupon Chriſt enjoyed *continuance* in the *love*, *and favour of his Father*? Why ſure, that was upon an *abſolute and unſpotted obedience*; *Ergo* it ſeems according to Mr. *Goodwin*, a *Regenerate man deſires not to perſevere in his faith*, *longer then he keeps his garment ſo clean, as to be as free from ſpot as Chriſt was from ſinne. Deum & hominum fidem!* Well, but whatever deſires a Regenerate man may chance to entertain, your words are evident, it is [the new man takes no pleaſure, rejoyceth not in any ſuch doctrine, which enſures either perſeverance in faith, or continuance in the favour and love of God to it, upon any other termes, then of walking holily, and humbly with him.] 1. This *it* doth not ſound well, *it* is no good *relative* to ſuch an *antecedent* as the *New man*. 2. [The new man deligheth (I will grant you) in no ſuch doctrine, as enſures the love and favour of God to him, upon any other termes, then of walking holily and humbly, with God;] but that is, 1. That he may *walke by* Gods love and favour holily and humbly with God; not that God would *withdraw* his love and favour, or the enſurance of his love and favour from him, when ever he walkes not according to that holineſſe and humility which God requires. *If thou, Lord, ſhalt be extreame to mark what is done amiſſe, O Lord, who ſhall ſtand?* who doth not walk too often contrary to thee? and wo were us, if thou ſhouldeſt preſently walk as contrary to us. The doctrine which the new man takes comfort in, is, that thou wilt when he walkes not ſo *holily*, *make* him walk the more *humbly*, yea, *heavily* for it; that thou wilt *hedge up his way with thornes*, and teach him as it were with *briars* to return to thee; *with words, Take away all iniquity, and receive me graciouſly*. The doctrine [which enſures the new man of perſeverance in faith, and continuance in the love and favour of God, but upon ſuch termes of walking holily and humbly with him,] as that at every turn that he walks *unholily*, and *unhumbly*, he ſhould loſe his faith and Gods favour, is a doctrine, that *no new man*, unleſſe it be one of the *new* and *laſt edition*, hath any great reaſon to take any great *comfort* in. But 3. our doctrine of perſeverance ſounds to this purpoſe, that it enſures no man of perſeverance in faith, and continuance in the love and favour of God, but upon ſuch termes, as that he *endeavour* to walk *holily* and *humbly* with God, *pray* unto God to *aſſiſt him* in theſe *endeavours*, to *pardon* him when he *failes* in theſe *endeavours*, *praiſe* God for *giving* him a *heart* for ſuch *eadeavours*, *abhorre himſelfe* as one that could not have had any ſuch deſires in his heart, unleſſe *God* had *given him* a new heart. This is the Tenour, according to which, the Spirit of our Doctrine of Perſeverance is wont to ſpeak: it ſuſpends *the aſſurance of the continuance* of the love and favour of God to us, *upon ſuch an holy and humble walking with God*: but it doth ſuſpend ſuch *an holy and humble walking with God*, upon *the continuance of Gods love and favour to us*. Now let us ſee what you ſay of that [upon theſe termes, The doctrine which teacheth a poſſibility of the Saints declining, inferreth both the ſaid glorious accommodations, with as high an hand of ſecurity as it, that is, our doctrine of perſeverance.] Surely your doctrine of the Apoſtaſie of the Saints, gives but a ſecurity at the beſt, that the Saints ſhall enjoy the love and favour of God, while they walke holily and humbly with him; but it doth not teach, that they ſhall enjoy the continuance of Gods love and favour to them, to keep them ſo as to make them walke holily and humbly with him, and ſo gives nothing ſuch comfort as our doctrine of perſeverance. But further, what if that *doctrine* did give any ſuch comfort, the point in queſtion is,

whether *ours* do give comfort? you do not ſpeak *ad idem*; unleſſe you prove *ours doth not* give comfort; it is not enough to ſay *yours doth*. And laſtly, let us examine what you infer from that Text, *John* 15. 10. *If ye keep my Commandments, ye ſhall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Fathers Commandments, and abide in his love.* Why? it ſeemeth as you ſay, [Chriſt enjoyed the continuance of his Fathers love and favour upon ſuch termes, as we enjoy his love and favour;] now if ſo, then obſerve what follows, but [we enjoy it upon ſuch terms (ſay you) as we may loſe it;] *Ergo*: ſo might Chriſt alſo; and further, if Chriſt had a will of the *ſame nature with ours* (as you muſt grant he had) then had his will ſuch *a liberty as ours*, and if ſuch a liberty as ours, then *a poſſibility of declining as* ours. We have no reaſon to be offended with you for denying the certainty of the *Saints perſeverance*; who teach that which inferres a *poſſibility* of *Chriſts non-perſeverance*, and *non-continuance in the* enjoyment of the love and favour of his Father. Thus it not being enough which you had done, to ſhew the *Angels in Heaven*, and conſequently the *Saints there*, are in [a capacity; though not ſo near a capacity as Regenerate men on earth are *of ſinning*] and ſo loſing their happineſſe, you have ſomewhat to adde, it ſeems of Chriſt *himſelfe* being in ſuch a *capacity*.

Quis cœlum terræ non miſceat, & mare cœlo?

The purpoſe of Chriſt in this place, is not to ſuſpend his *Fathers love* meerly upon *his keeping his Fathers Commandments*, for the Father *loved him before* any ſuch *keeping of his Commandments* from all eternity. But to ſhew that *he kept his Fathers* Commandments, and *continued in the* love of his Father, & as he *could not but* continue in his Fathers love, ſo *could he not* faile in keeping his Commandments; and as he *could not faile* in keeping his Fathers Commandments, ſo *could he not faile* to continue in his Fathers love; his Fathers love, and his keeping his Commandments, were both inſeparable, as to *themſelves* and to *him*. 2. Nor is the purpoſe of Chriſt to ſuſpend the *continuance of his diſciples in his love*, or their *keeping of his Commandments*, as the *cauſe* of it; for he *loved them firſt*, and his continuance of his *love* to them was the cauſe of their *keeping his Commandments*; they did it by grace received, and continued from *him*. But, 3. It is to ſhew the *connexion* of their *continuing in his love*, and *keeping his Commandments*, which go together, their *continuing in his love* being the *cauſe* of their *keeping his Commandments*; their *keeping his Commandments being* the *ſigne* and *evidence* to them of *their continuance in his love*; as when he ſaith, *If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my diſciples indeed*, *John* 8. 31. His meaning is not *their continuing in* his Word, *made* them, but *ſhewed* them to be his *diſciples indeed*, but as it followes there, and *Ye ſhall know the truth*, where the meaning is not, ye ſhall *ſimply know it*, for ſo muſt they, and did they, before they could be ſtiled his *diſciples*, or *continue in his Word*, but the ſenſe is, you ſhall know *more of the truth*; ſo here, ye *ſhall continue in my love*, ſignifies, you ſhall continue *more ſweetly and comfortably in my love*, or have *more* experience of my love in *more* bleſſed operations upon you. All this is ſpoken to ſhew the *connexion* between *Chriſts love to his diſciples*, and *their continuance in his Commandments*; but not a *cauſality* on the part of their keeping his Commandments, upon their *ſimple continuance* in his love, but only upon a *ſweet ſenſe* of their *continuance in it*, and the *new influences of his love upon them*. And thus our doctrine of perſeverance teacheth the ſame to an hair, nor is all you have ſaid againſt it, worth a louſe. Proceed we now,

In denſis ſilvis venor bis quinque catellis,
Quod capio perdo, ——

§. 3. [Yea, the truth is (ſay you) that the received doctrine of perſeverance, is ſo farre from gratifying the ſpiritual part of a man, that it is to it, what *Peter* was to Chriſt, when he counſelled him to pity himſelfe, I mean an *offence*, or what theſe Chriſtians were unto *Paul*, of whom he complained, that they *brake his heart with weeping*;] very good, and yet doth the [generality of profeſſors ſo impotently rejoyce] in what breaks the heart, as it were of their ſpirit *with weeping*, are they ſo fond of that which is an *offence to it?* you will make the *new men ſtrange* men, if you can perſwade us they ſo dearly *love* what is an *offence* to their *ſpirit*, and ſet their hearts ſo ſtrongly on what doth

doth *break* them. We attend your Reaſon for this aſſertion.

[For it, *viz.* the doctrine of perſeverance ſecretly whiſpers to it, ſuch things, the nature and proper tendency whereof, is to ſcatter what the Spirit hath gathered; to diſſolve and break the ſtrength of thoſe holy principles and reſolutions, wherewith the regenerate part hath harneſſed, and armed it ſelf againſt temptations unto evil. When the new man in a ſervant of God, ſhall with *Paul* have reaſoned and reſolved thus; *I will keep under my body, and bring it into ſubjection, leſt that by any meanes, when I have preached unto others, I my ſelf ſhould be a caſt-away.* He that ſhall come and inſinuate unto him, *whether thou keepeſt under thy body or no; whether thou bringeſt it into ſubjection, or whether thou ſuffereſt it to waxe wanton againſt Chriſt: thou ſhalt be in no danger, in no poſſibility of being a Caſt-away*; ſhall he not looſen the very foundation, of ſuch a reſolution, which was the ſenſe and apprehenſion of the great danger of being a Caſt-away, in caſe his body were not kept under? or ſuppoſe a man ſhould argue and conclude thus with himſelf; *I will labour with my hands, that I may have wherwith, both to ſubſiſt honeſtly, and do good to others*; Would not ſuch a ſuggeſtion as this to him, *that he ſhall have that which will be abundantly ſufficient for both purpoſes, whether he labour with his hands or no*, be a temptation and ſnare to him, to retract his Concluſion in that kinde?]

I anſwer, in this which you ſay, of the [ſecret whiſper of the doctrine of Perſeverance,] you but perſevere in a loud ſlandering of this doctrine; it ſpeaks neither openly nor ſecretly one ſyllable to this purpoſe; ſo farre is it from [*ſcattering* what the Spirit hath gathered] that it rather *bindes it up*: and ſo farre from [unharneſſing it,] that it *girdeth* on its armour ſo much the *cloſer*. It never [ſuggeſted to any regenerare man that whether he kept his body under or no, he was in no danger, no poſſibility of being a Caſt-away.] I do not ſay, but the *fleſh* poſſibly may take *occaſion* in a regenerate man, to [*whiſper*] ſome ſuch thing, as conſonant to the doctrine of Perſeverance, but in this the *fleſh lies* as much as the *devil*. The doctrine of perſeverance abhorres the thought of it, it ſayes, that if the ſervant of God keep not under his body the *moſt he can*, and *pray not* to God to *help him*, but ſuffer himſelf to *wax wanton againſt Chriſt*, he hath no *part in Chriſt*; and eſpecially if he allow himſelf upon this doctrine, *turning the very grace of God into wantonneſſe*. It ſayes, that God *will give him grace to keep under his body*, and that he *will deliver him from that law of his members*, and from *that body of death*, and give *him victory through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord*; it tells him, that Gods *grace ſhall be ſufficient for him*; it doth not ſay, that *grace hath abounded that ſin may much more abound*, but that *grace ſhall abound to caſt out his ſin*; and it bids him beware how he allow himſelf in the *leaſt ſin*, for that *that ſin* muſt coſt him many a *ſoure taſte* of repentance, and ſhall *undoubtedly* do ſo. This is no encouragement to allow himſelf in it. Nor [doth this doctrine ſpeak, as he that would diſſwade a man from labouring, upon aſſurance he ſhall have enough to ſupply his occaſions, though he ſit ſtill, and conſume all in idleneſſe.] It indeed ſaith, he *ſhall have ſtrength to labour*, and albeit by his labour he *get but a little*, yet he ſhall have *no lack*; but if he *abate of his labour*, this doctrine gives him *no hope of abundance*, yea, or *any thing without it*; in all this you do *fortiter*——and *audacter calumniari*, as hoping that according to the old word, *aliquid adherebit*. It is enough that our doctrine *proteſts* her *innocency*; till you prove your *charge*. [The doctrine, ſay you, whiſpers ſo,] ſhew which of her *teachers* of this doctrine ſaid ſo, unleſſe ſuch as never learned it, and ſpeake of what they never underſtood. Doctor Ranter, who never did any Exerciſe in any of our Schooles, but owes all his learning and honours to *Layton* Buzzard. We hiſſe ſuch out of our ſocieties into the order of *Hagio Maſtix*.

——*Multúmque toroſa juventus*
Ingeminat tremulos naſo criſpante cachinnos.

You proceed, [If it be here ſaid, Yea, but a certain knowledge, and full aſſurance, that God will never ceaſe to love me, will beſtow ſalvation and bleſſednеſſe upon me, §. 18.

me, whatſoever my failings be, is an effectual motive unto my heart and ſoule, to cleave unto him in all love and faithfulneſſe, and conſequently is nouriſhing, chearing and ſtrengthening, even to the inner man.]

I anſwer, Stay a while; And 1. Take what we ſay *aright*, we do not *give* men aſſurance of Gods love whatever *ſins*, though we do [whatever failings there be] meerly out of *weakneſſe*. And as for thoſe *failings*, as we aſſure the ſervants of God of *bleſſednesſe*, notwithſtanding thoſe *failings*, ſo do we of *grace* to *bewaile*, to *watch over*, to *withſtand*, to *amend* in good meaſure thoſe *failings*. We bid him examine himſelf, whether his *failings* in duties be not *faintings* in *comfort* to him? and then upon his *fainting* we *comfort* him againſt his *failings*, and bid him aſſure himſelf, that his *loathing of his failings* and *himſelf* for them, proceeds from *Gods grace working on him*, and that *gracious work*, from *Gods love* to him, and that where *he thus loves, he loves to the end*, that he gives this *jewel* to none but his *Spouſe*, whom he never *divorceth*, having *married* her to himſelf in *judgment and faithfulneſſe*.

2. Take this with you, that ſuch an *aſſurance of Gods love notwithſtanding our failings*, is from an *hatred of our failings*, wrought not ſo much *by our own love to goodneſſe*, as *Gods love to us*; and this ſenſe *of Gods love to us*, ſtirres up *our love to God*, and ſo is truly *ſtrengthening* to the *inner man*; *Love is ſtrong as death, Neſcit molimina tarda*. Now I am ready to take an account of your Anſwer, which you draw up in foure ſeveral Articles.

[1. That the inner or new man in the Saints takes no pleaſure at all, in any ſuch motion or perſwaſion as this, *That he may or ſhall enjoy the love of God, or ſalvation it ſelf, under the practice of all manner of ſinne and wickedneſſe whatſoever*. The very ſound of theſe laſt words is harſh and uncouth unto it; nor can it eaſily be perſwaded that any ſuch perſwaſion is from God,]

Speak out man [not eaſily] not *poſſibly* [be perſwaded that any ſuch perſwaſion is] or can be [from God] or from any teacher approved by God, or from any that *hath been taught as the truth is in Jeſus*, yea, as Reaſon it ſelf teacheth. Reaſon abhorres theſe words as horrible, the leſſe reaſon and ſhame have you, that would put them into the mouth of the Saints *doctrine of Perſeverance*. And now I pray have patience, to heare me compare what you ſuppoſed we ſaid, with what you ſay in your anſwer to it: 1. [You ſuppoſed there we ſaid, *God would not ceaſe to love his ſervant, and beſtow ſalvation and bleſſednesſe upon him, whatſoever his failings ſhould be*;] there 'tis but [*failings*,] here you ſpeak of [*all manner of ſinne and wickedneſſe whatſoever*] is [all manner of ſinne and wickedneſſe whatſoever] come to be called gently and gentlely, but [*failings*.] *Theſe* are out of *weakneſſe*, *thoſe* are the very *heights* of *wickedneſſe*, wickedneſſe *triumphant*, wickedneſſe *top* and *top*-gallant, wickedneſſe like a King upon the Throne, in its [Autocratorical Majeſty, *againſt which there is no riſing up*,] this then is one failing of yours, in confounding [failings, and all manner of ſinne and wickedneſſe whatſoever.] 2. [You ſuppoſed there we ſaid, God will not ceaſe to love his ſervant, and beſtow ſalvation and bleſſednesſe upon him, whatſoever his failings be.] Here you ſpeak of [enjoying ſalvation it ſelf, under the practice of all manner of ſinne and wickedneſſe whatſoever.] Now let any ſober man judge, whether there be not as great a diſtance between theſe two, as between earth and heaven. It is one thing to ſay, *His ſervants ſhall enjoy ſalvation, and be brought to heaven, whatſoever their failings ſhall be*, yea, *whatſoever their ſinnes and wickedneſſe have been*; another to ſay, *he ſhall enjoy ſalvation, and be brought to heaven*, [*under the practice of whatſoever wickedneſſe*.] We ſay, God will *ſubdue their ſins*, before they *enjoy ſalvation*. You ſpeak as if we dream't they ſhould enjoy ſalvation *under*, or *during the practice of wickedneſſe*. Yea, Sir, we do not ſay, they *have any aſſurance while they practiſe wickedneſſe that ever they ſhall enjoy ſalvation*, notwithſtanding Gods love be *ſure even then*, in reſpect of *himſelf* as to his *decree*; yet is it not ſo to *any man* in reſpect of *him*, and as to the *execution of that decree of God*. Now, Sir, the notion which you have brought here, we ſpeak as highly againſt it, as you, but you have little to ſay for your ſelf, in framing ſo abſurd and abominable a notion, and faſtening on us, yea or a

ſpeech

ſpeech pretended by you to be made by us, which hath nothing in it but what ſounds to a ſenſe as diſtant from it, as heaven is from hell.

Secondly, ſay you, [Should it be granted, that a full and perfect aſſurance of the continuance of the love of God upon all, upon any termes whatſoever, even of the greateſt ſin and wickedneſſe, would be an effectual motive unto the heart and conſcience of a regenerate man, to cleave in love unto God; yet would it not be a motive in this kinde, of any ſuch ſtrength or efficacy, as ſuch an aſſurance as this, that he ſhall continue in the love and favour of God for ever, in a way of righteouſneſſe and well-doing, but withal, ſhall be in danger of loſing this love, in caſe he ſhall decline unto wickedneſſe.]

I anſwer, 1. That we *aſſure* no man of [*enjoying the love of God upon all, upon any termes whatſoever, even of the greateſt ſin and wickedneſſe,*] and we *tremble* at ſuch a thought; and if you conſider it better, you muſt needs bluſh at your abſurd repreſentation of our doctrine: What to [aſſure men of enjoying the love of God upon any ſuch termes as theſe?] I pray whereunto relates this [upon *ſuch termes*] to [*the love of God*] that is, as if we made *wickedneſſe* termes whereupon to *enjoy Gods love*: fie upon it. To *the continuance of Gods love*? that is, as if we made wickedneſſe the *termes* whereupon God *continues his love to us.* Fie ſtill. To aſſurance, that is, as if we made *wickedneſſe the termes whereupon we aſſure our ſelves of the continuance of Gods love*, is there no cephalical pill to be had at the next ſhop? either your head was ſtrangely out of tune, or elſe your heart was ſet upon ſlandering; ſo then this is a wretched miſ-repreſenting of your friends doctrine. The Lord rebuke it.

2. The heart of a regenerate man, ſay we, is not without feare of [danger of loſing Gods love upon declining to wickedneſſe;] but as he [declines to wickedneſſe] ſo God withdrawes his love, that is, the *expreſſions* of it, the *comfort* of it from him. But *Gods love* continues, ſo as that he afterwards *fetcheth off* the regenerate man with *grief* of heart from his *declining*.

[3. But the danger of loſing Gods love,] is by your leave no [motive in any kinde of any ſtrength or efficacy to cleave in love unto God] the [motive of love,] muſt be good, not evil; as is the [danger of loſing the love of God;] This is a motive of *feare* ſure, none of *love*. Do you think any ſonne loves his father the more, becauſe his father may, in caſe of his miſcarriage, withdraw his affections, correct, yea, diſinherit him? this works *feare*, but no *love*. This may work a feare of *doing* any *outward act contrary to love*, but it doth not, nor can it work *any inward love*; doth a wife love her husband the more, for that in caſe ſhe offend, he will uſe her hardly? let the weakeſt of the weaker ſexe judge, what ſtrength there is in your pretended motive of cleaving to God in love, *viz.* [danger of loſing his love.] In the mean time weigh we your Reaſon, why [this latter compounded motive muſt needs be of more efficacy to the purpoſe mentioned then the former, becauſe the latter ſuppoſeth a neceſſity of this cleaving in love to God, for the obtaining of this great good, the continuance for ever of the love of God towards him, which the former doth not. Now this is a general rule, that that motive is ſtill of greater force, to perſwade to an action, which renders the action perſwaded unto, as of abſolute neceſſity for the obtaining of ſome deſirable end, eſpecially when the ſaid end is aſſured withal, upon the performance of the action, then that which renders the end attainable, without the performance of the action. He that ſhall perſwade me to love ſuch or ſuch a man, by telling me, that whether I love him or no, yet he will deal lovingly and friendly by me, ſhould not perſwade me to love him, by an argument or motive of ſo much ſtrength, as he that ſhould move me to the ſame point thus, *If you love him, he will deal very lovingly and friendly with you, but if you ſhall neglect or voluntarily injure him, you will finde him a ſore enemie.*]

I anſwer, that I know not, whether more to wonder at the ſtrangeneſſe of your *judgement*, or of your *affections*. Certainly both your *Logick*, and your love are of a different ſtraine from that of *ordinary men*; as ſhall more particularly appear by and by. For firſt, for your Reaſon, I deſire you to obſerve, 1. That you change the

caſe; for that whereas you ſaid before [danger of loſing the love of God, was a motive to cleave to him in love] ſuch a one ſure, as was not found in heaven till you preach't your new doctrine, of the [Angels being in a capacity of ſinning] and conſequently of loſing the favour of God; now you come off with this, [the neceſſity of cleaving to God in love, for the obtaining of this great good, the continuance for ever of the love of God to him] there is an altering the caſe. But 2. Howbeit [this neceſſity of a mans cleaving to God in love, for the continuance for ever, of Gods love to him] be ſuppoſed, yet the [danger of loſing Gods love] was expreſſed, as [the motive to love God, or cleave to him in love.] But 3. This [neceſſity of loving God, that God may continue for ever his love to man] is not to be acknowledged, for *God loved man firſt*, and ever *after* for his *own ſake*, not *mans*; not becauſe *we loved him, but he loved us firſt*. 4. The [neceſſity of cleaving to God in love, that God may continue for ever his love to a man] is nothing ſo ſtrong a motive to love, as the aſſurance of ſuch a love in God, as will continue, though a man cleave not ſo faſt to him, the more *love is in God*, the more attractive is it *of the love of man, ut ameris ama*. Now there is more *love in God*, in caſe he *continue to love a man*, whether he *continue to cleave to God in love or no*, then there is love in him, ſo as *to continue to love him*, in caſe he do continue to *cleave to God in love*, and conſequently *this love* being *greater*, is more *attractive* of love in *man*, and ſo a *ſtronger motive* to the *man regenerate* to *cleave to God in love*. What you ſay of [a motive to an action] may be true, as to *outward* actions, but the *inward* action, or rather *affection* of love is much more ſtrongly drawn, by a love of ſuch a height and conſiſtency, as will *overcome hatred with love*, *and love in deſpite of all ill offices*, wherewith it is repaid. The regenerate mans love to God, as farre as he is regenerate, is of this make, to love God the *more*, the *leſſe danger* there is of *loſing Gods love*. *Perfect love caſteth out feare*, and *all feare hath torment*. Thus for your Reaſon, you have ſhewed but a weak one, to prove the ſtrength of this new motive to love; Neceſſity of cleaving to God in love, for the continuing of his love,] that is, [the danger of its non-continuance without this cleaving to God in love.] And more, he who loves God upon *this motive*, loves not God *properly*, but the *love of God*; and that amounts to as much as to love *himſelf* for his own *ſake alone*, it is he deſires *God ſhould love him*, and without this he looks not upon God as worthy of his love.

2. As to your affections, you ſay, [You ſhould be perſwaded to love the man, who would be your ſore enemie, in caſe you neglect him or voluntarily injure him,] that word ſhould not have been put laſt without ſome ſuch terme, as *eſpecially* waiting upon it, [and not ſo much to love him, who would deal lovingly and friendly with you, however you behaved your ſelf towards him.] This ſhewes your love to be of no *generous temper*; it ſhewes you to be of a lower then the Phariſees, yea, the Publicans ſpirit, who love thoſe who loved them, but you love none ſo well as thoſe who will be [your enemies and ſore ones too, if you neglect them, eſpecially voluntarily injure them;] then it ſeems that you do not [neglect, yea, voluntarily injure your friends] is only for *feare* not for *love*. For *feare* leſt they ſhould become [ſore enemies] to you, and principally the way to purchaſe your friendſhip, is to threaten you with being your *enemie* if you will not do it; this is right new diſcovery: yet for my part I will never purchaſe your friendſhip upon ſuch termes, but will be alwayes ready to ſerve you; though you ſhould look on me as your *enemie*, I will be alwayes very much a ſervant to you for your worthy parts, though, God wot, moſt unworthily miſimployed. What pitty it is, ſo much wit ſhould be in ſuch keeping?

Si quis in hoc artem populo non novit amandi,
Me legat, & lecto carmine doctus amet.

To conclude, [There is no action, how lovely or deſirable ſoever in it ſelfe, but becomes ſo much the more deſirable, by how much the greater good ſhall depend upon

upon it, and muſt needs be produced by it, eſpecially if it ſhall yet further appear, that this good cannot be produced or obtained by any other means whatſoever without it. Now then as he who deprives a man of a greater benefit, to intereſſe him in a leſſe, doth him as reall an injury or wrong, as he that ſhould take away a part of his ſubſtance from him, without any conſideration at all; in like manner that doctrine, which ſhall bereave the ſpiritual part of man, of a greater and more effectual motive to the performance of a duty, only to preſent him with a weaker, and of leſſe power, muſt in reaſon be judged an enemie unto the one and the other, yea, as great an enemie as ſuch a doctrine would be, which denies them a leſſer motive in that kinde, without any recompence at all.]

I anſwer, 1. That I ſhall not trouble my ſelf or the Reader, with a calculation of the injuries which thoſe doctrines do to men, which [deny them greater motives to give them leſſe;] but ſurely the doctrine which [denies them a greater motive to give them a leſſe,] doth not do them ſo great an injury as thoſe which deny them a greater, and do not as much as think of *recompencing* them with a *leſſe*; as he that ſhall take my *houſe* from me, and give me a *cottage* in *lieu* of it, doth me ſomewhat a leſſe injury, then he who takes my *houſe* from me, and leaves me not a *hole* where to lay my head.

But 2. Our doctrine of perſeverance doth not [take away a greater motive to love God, and ſubſtitute a leſſe in the room of it,] but only takes away that which you *account* a greater motive to love him, when indeed it is *none* at all [the danger of his diſpleaſure or hatred,] and gives that which is of all other motives the moſt powerful.

3. You ſpeak very untowardly [of greater good depending upon an action, as a motive to that action] in this caſe; for having told us how [you ſhould be perſwaded to love a man, chiefly upon a perſwaſion, that in caſe you did not love him, he would become your ſore enemie.] This love of yours, call it *action* or what you will, doth not in this caſe depend upon the hope of *obtaining a good*, but the feare of *avoiding an evil*, and how *feare* ſhould cauſe *love*, is that which I long to be indoctrined in. *Love caſts out feare*: *feare* can never *bring in love*. If you *love God out of feare*, I feare you *love your ſelf* much more then *God*. A regenerate man, as regenerate, is drawn by *love* to a reverential feare of *offending* God: a feare that God will be *offended*, cannot poſſibly be a motive to *love*: that is an affection which is drawn by an *apprehenſion* of *good*, not of *evill*.

You have made a rare diſcovery of a new myſtery of love, to be drawn by feare: This is as ſome body would [compel, and then deſired pardon for the word compel his Prince to the love of Parliaments.] The regenerate mans love to God is drawn by ſweeter, choicer and *finer cords*, the *bands of love*.

§. 19. [If, ſay you, ſuch a knowledge or aſſurance, as the objection ſpeaks of, were an effectual motive to perſwade the heart of a man to cleave to God in love, what reaſon can be given why God ſhould not adminiſter it in order to ſuch a purpoſe, as well to his enemies and carnal men, as unto his Saints or friends? You ſhall hear anon a ſufficient reaſon why he ſhould not; in the *interim* I will examine the three weighty reaſons, which you bring to prove he ſhould; [for certain it is, that all men whatſoever are commanded by God to love him, and to cleave in this affection unto him.] I anſwer, true, but it followes not, [becauſe they are commanded to love him,] *Ergo* God ſhould give them ſuch aſſurance of his love to them, as he doth to his Saints. His Saints are commanded to love him long before they have ſuch aſſurance of Gods *love to them*, as this we ſpeak of. This followes upon *their anſwering* Gods Command, and upon *their loving* of God; it doth not *go before* it. God *before* doth enough to *deſerve* mens love, and may juſtly *require it*; but *till they love God* they cannot expect God ſhould *love them*, ſo as ſurely to *ſave them*, much leſſe can they *aſſure themſelves* of it. Mens *not loving* of God, deſerves Gods *hatred* of them; till their hearts aſſure them *they love God*, they cannot aſſure themſelves *God loves them*, ſo as to ſettle upon them an inheritance in heaven; this aſſurance is not founded upon Commands, but Promiſes. Now though the *Com-*

mands

mands be *abſolute*, the *Promiſes* are *conditional*; the *Commands* are founded upon what is *paſt*, the *Promiſes* look to what is to *come*; and aſſure *bleſſings de futuro*, only upon a *condition de præſenti*. Wicked men, not having the *condition*, that is, *not loving God*, though they muſt confeſſe they are *bound* to love him for *bleſſings* already *received*, cannot aſſure themſelves of *ſuch bleſſings to come*, as are to come, only upon condition they *love God* heartily and ſincerely.

2. Say you, [As certain it is, that God is not defective in the ſubminiſtration of motives unto them, *i. e.* natural, wicked men in this behalfe; no, not thoſe that are moſt proper and efficacious to perſwade them thereunto.] Right, the *temporal bleſſings* which Gods bounty beſtows on the *wickedſt* men, are motives [proper and efficacious to the love of God:] but men refuſing to ſhew love to God upon ſuch *motives*, are unworthy in the higheſt degree, that God ſhould *aſſure them of eternal bleſſings* in heavenly places: yea, God doth aſſure them of *ſuch, if they love him*, yet are theſe motives too weak; we ſee it by experience. Will you have God aſſure them of bleſſings, though they do not love him? this is ſo farre from being a [motive moſt proper and efficacious, to perſwade love,] that it is clear, it would perſwade them to continue *not to love him*. Beſides, God cannot give them aſſurance of this, without giving himſelf the lie; for he hath ſaid, No hater of God and his holineſſe, *ſhall ſee his face*.

3. Say you, [As certain it is, as either of the former, that an aſſurance of the love of God toward them, againſt all ſinne and wickedneſſe whatſoever, that they are capable of committing, is a motive every way as taking with, as ſuitable and pleaſing to natural and carnal men, if yet a motive it be; as to ſpiritual and holy men, to perſwade them to the love of God; Therefore if God hath not thought meet to afford ſuch a motive as this unto natural or carnal men, it is no wayes likely that he hath afforded it unto Saints, with whom it hath no agreement or takingneſſe at all, as was ſhewed formerly.]

I anſwer, Very true, it hath none, nor do any of us, I trow, dream of any [aſſurance of the love of God againſt all ſinne and wickedneſſe whatſoever, that we are capable of committing,] unleſſe in this ſenſe, that the love of God will triumph over all ſinne and wickedneſſe we are capable of committing, by making us repent of it, with as much *ſorrow* and *ſhame*, as we are capable of admitting. You are in again at your old calumnie, as if we tanght [the Saints to aſſure themſelves of the love of God, commit they what ſin and wickedneſſe they can,] this in the mean time is a contradiction *in adjecto*; for how can they be *Saints*, if they allow themſelves ſuch a *licentiouſneſſe of ſinning*? Now we ſpeak of aſſurance, that *Saints* have of their *Perſeverance* and *continuance of the love of God*. We do not aſſure *monſters* of it, nay, our doctrine is ſuch, as ſhewes it *impoſſible* for God to aſſure *wicked men of ſalvation*, or *Saints in wickedneſſe*. When you ſay, [God hath not thought meet to afford this motive, *viz.* aſſurance, unto natural or carnal men,] we ſay, It is not poſſible he ſhould: But it followes not but he doth it to his Saints. He aſſures his Saints of his love and ſalvation, notwithſtanding their *weakneſſe* which they *bewaile*, and this makes for the magnifying of his *mercy*; he cannot aſſure deſperate *ſinners* of his *love* and *ſalvation*, during their *wickedneſſe*, in which they glory, without diſhonour to his *juſtice*.

Fourthly and laſtly, you ſay, [The very truth is, all things duly conſidered, that the conſideration we now ſpeak of, & which is ſpecified in the objection.] *You* ſpeak of it, *we* do not [*ſpecifie* or *ſpeak*] of any ſuch love, as hath nothing at all in it of the true nature or propertie of a motive to perſwade any man to cleave to God in love: whatſoever repreſenteth God to the heart, ſoule or conſcience of a man, as a God, in *whoſe ſight he is good that doth evil*, and conſequently as no God of *judgement*: As a God promiſing his love, favour and acceptance, as well unto *dogs returning unto their vomits, and to ſwine after their waſhing to their wallowing in the mire*, as unto *lambs and ſheep*, is no conſideration which commends him unto his creature, man, or conſequently which hath any thing in it to engage him to cleave in love to him.]

True; but do we [repreſent God, as a God, in *whoſe ſight he is good that doth evil?*]

evil?] We ſay the Saints do *not commit ſin*, 1 *John* 3. that they are rather *paſſive* then *active* in ſin. Do we [repreſent God as promiſing his love and favour unto dogs returning to their vomit, and ſwine wallowing (after waſhing) in the mire?] Are the Saints ſuch *dogs returning to their vomit, or ſwine wallowing (after waſhing) in the mire?* We aſſure none of Gods love in this kinde, but *Saints*; they are neither the *one* nor the other, but *ſheep* and *lambs*. We aſſure *ſtraying ſheep* of Gods love, that in his love he will reduce them to their *fold*. What have we to do with *dogs and ſwine*? all this is but *barking* and *grunting* againſt *God* and his *Saints*. You ſpeak after the ſame rate in what followes.

[Suppoſe a man were thus principled, that having once had a good opinion of any man, he would never alter his opinion of him, how deſperately ſoever the man ſhould degenerate from himſelf, though he ſhould become the firſt-born of all the ſonnes of *Belial*, turn the moſt bloody murtherer, the moſt cruel oppreſſour, the moſt brutiſh inceſtuary under heaven, yet under the guilt and daily practice of theſe and ſuch like abominations, ſhould love this man with as much truth, reality and ſincereneſſe of affection, only upon the account of his ſometime goodneſs, as he doth the moſt vertuous and worthy perſon under heaven, would ſuch a temper or principle as this, commend him as a perſon ſo much the more worthy love and reſpects in the eyes of any conſidering man? or would they not rather draw diſparagement and contempt upon him, yea, and this from thoſe very perſons, whom he ſhall affect and love upon ſuch termes?] I yield it would, but what is this to us?

Yes, ſay you, [therefore in caſe it were poſſible for me to know certainly, that how looſely, how prophanely, how debauchedly ſoever I ſhould behave my ſelf, yet God will love me as entirely, as fervently, as he doth the holieſt and moſt righteous man under heaven, it would be a very ſlender motive unto me, to cleave in love unto him]

I anſwer, We abhorre all this, to ſay that the Saints may [certainly know, that God doth entirely and fervently love them, if they ſhould ſo degenerate. We ſay, God in his love *preſerves them from ſuch degenerating*. We teach the *Perſeverance* of Saints through *Gods love*, we do not talk of the continuance of Gods love to *Apoſtates*. We ſay, God is *merciful to his Saints*, ſo as to *heal their back-ſlidings*; we do not repreſent him, as loving to ſuch as offend of *malicious wickedneſſe*. It is a contradiction that they ſhould be *Saints*, and *ſuch ſinners*. The *beſt Saints* are guilty of *ſinnes* many times of a *high nature*: but even then, though the *acts* be ſo hainons for the *matter*; they are not ſo hainous as *leſſe acts* in *wicked men*, for the *manner* of them. They are (good men) *inſnared* into them, perhaps *hurried*, and they do not *lie* in them without *remorſe*, but by the grace of God *deteſt* both their *ſins* and *themſelves* for them, *accept the puniſhment of their ſins*, and ſay, *it is leſſe then their iniquities have deſerved*. They do not as deſperate wicked men, juſtifie themſelves, extenuate, perhaps extol their ſins, and *glory in their ſhame*. How have you ſhewed an impotent ſpleen in this impertinent babble, as in the Concluſion of it, that [there is nothing in the doctrine of Perſeverance, that contributes to the peace and comfort of that which is of God, but only to that which is of Satan in men, and which deſerveth mortification and crucifying, in ſtead of comfort and peace?] It is true, there is too much of [*Satan*] in the beſt of *Saints*, too much that [*deſerves mortification and crucifying*,] but our doctrine ſpeaks no comfort to *that*; all it ſayes to the Saints, is, *that God will help them to mortifie and crucifie*, what ever is in them, either of *Satan* or their own *fleſh*; that albeit they may be ſometimes *captivated* by ſin, they ſhall be at laſt *delivered* from it; that albeit they be *ſurprized* and *held* by it, they ſhall at laſt be *happily reſcued*. This is the tenour of our doctrine, that *God ſhall bruiſe Satan under the feet of his Saints*, albeit he ſometimes *bite*, yea, and *binde* their *heels*; that albeit he *buffet them*, God ſhall in good time *break him*, that the *thornes* in their *fleſh*, ſhall help by Gods grace to *let out their corruption*; that their *temptations* ſtall be one day the matter of their *triumphs*. We ſay not, God loves them *in their iniquities*, otherwiſe then *to draw them out of them*; and that the greateſt part

of ſalvation is from *their ſinne*. In all this you hunted counter, and but ſpent your mouth upon a wrong ſent, none of the Saints *feet* leave ſo *rank* a one. You do but *ſlander the footſteps of Gods anointed.*

§. 21. [If it be yet further objected, But is not the new doctrine of falling away a very uncomfortable doctrine, apt to beget a ſervile ſpirit in the Saints, or ſpirit of bondage and feare? or muſt not they who apprehend themſelves to be in continual danger of falling away and periſhing, needs eat their bread in darkneſſe, dwell with ſorrowes and perplexities of ſoule, all their dayes? To theſe, and all other demands of like import with them,]

I anſwer, 1. To be in *danger* of falling away, and to be under a *poſſibility* of falling away, are two very different things.] I yield, there is a ſufficient difference between them, and you had need to make a wide one, as who aſſert a [poſſibility of the Angels declining, a capacity of it, though not ſo near as that of regenerate men,] but ſurely yield a [poſſibility of a regenerate mans falling away] and his *dangers* are ſo *great*, as the objection will ſtill hold its own, that the [regenerate man muſt eat in darkneſſe, and dwell in ſorrow,] as being compaſſed about with ſo many enemies and traitors, ſo many baits and ſnares, that it is Gods eſpecial aſſiſtance, and the continuance of it, that alone can put him into a *poſſibility of ſtanding.*

But, ſay you, [they have ſecurity enough, and the reaſon is, becauſe though men be in a poſſibility of falling into the fire, and being burnt; into the water, and being drowned; from the tops of houſes and ſteeples, and being daſh't in pieces; yet no man lives ever a whit the more uncomfortably, becauſe they know that God hath given them reaſon and underſtanding ſufficient to preſerve themſelves: in like manner, God having vouchſafed unto the Saints means abundantly ſufficient to preſerve themſelves from Apoſtaſie, and conſequently from periſhing, ſo that they need not apoſtatize or periſh, if themſelves pleaſe, there is no occaſion at all, much leſſe any neceſſity, why they ſhould live any whit the more uncomfortably, or abate ſo much as the leaſt haire of their head, in confidence of being ſaved, only becauſe they are under a poſſibility of declining, and ſo of periſhing.]

I anſwer, that notwithſtanding all other [means, God hath vouchſafed the Saints whereby to preſerve themſelves from apoſtatizing and periſhing,] unleſſe he were pleaſed to continue his *eſpecial grace*, and thereby to enable them to make *uſe* of theſe *means*, they would be in no *poſſibility of ſtanding*. Without *this*, the *means* for their *preſervation* are no way proportionable to the *danger* of their *falling*. He knows not the ſubtilty of the devil, the temptations of the world, the corruptions of the fleſh, in the beſt Saints that denies it. Alas, what if [men live nothing the leſſe comfortably, though they be in a poſſibility of falling into the fire, water, from tops of houſes and ſteeples,] they need not feare, they will *caſt themſelves* into [fire or water,] or as much as ſtand on the [tops of houſes and ſteeples;] but if they were ſet on the [tops of houſes and ſteeples] in the midſt of a mighty *whirlewinde*, or were *thruſt* by a power greater then their own, into the [water or fire] at every turn, they had reaſon to feare daſhing, burning, drowning; This is the caſe of the *beſt Saints*, they have *enemies* enough to *thruſt* them into ſuch *miſchiefs*, as Apoſtaſie and periſhing; yea, and ſeeming *friends*, to whom they are too apt to give their hands, to *draw* them into ſuch miſchiefs; yea, they often fall into many a fearful *ſin* and would *lie* in it till they periſhed, unleſſe God graciouſly drew them out; and which is more, they would not without his grace, be as much as ſenſible of their danger; they would be *drowned* ere they felt themſelves *drench't*, and *burnt* ere they complained of being *ſcalded*, and *daſh't* all-to-pieces ere they found themſelves *fallen*. It is only the aſſurance of *Gods Providence to watch* over them, and *grace* to *work* in them, that can ſuffice to make them *live comfortably* amidſt the ſnares of *death*, wherewith they are continually compaſſed. But, ſay you,

[The Apoſtle *Paul* acknowledged himſelf to have been under a poſſibility of being made a Reprobate or Caſt-away, *Leſt*, ſaith he, *having preached unto others, I my*

ſelf

ſelf ſhould prove or become a Caſt-away. Yet at what an excellent rate and height of confidence, yea, of joy unſpeakable and glorious did he live? *I am perſwaded,* (ſaith he,) *that neither death, nor life, nor Angels, nor Principalities, nor Powers, nor things preſent, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature ſhall be able to ſeparate us from the love of God which is in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord.* That which miniſtred unto him the ground-work of this moſt raiſed and bleſſed confidence, notwithſtanding the poſſibility he was under, of being made a *Caſt-away*, was partly that clear and certain knowledge which he had of the unchangeable purpoſe of God, to give ſalvation unto all thoſe, who ſhould perſevere in faith and holineſſe unto the end, partly alſo the like knowledge of the bounty of God towards all his Saints, in vouchſafing unto them ſo rich and full a proportion of means as he doth, whereby to perſevere accordingly.]

I anſwer, 1. *Denying* that [*Paul* acknowledgeth himſelf in a poſſibility of being made a Reprobate,] ſurely it was utterly *impoſſible*. Gods decree of *Election* was irreverſible: that word, I ſhould be made a *Caſt-away*, referres at moſt but to *damnation*, not to *Reprobation*. Now he was, I yield, under a *poſſibility of damnation*, as to the *merit* of his ſin, yea, in *danger* of it, and could not without *Gods mercy poſſibly eſcape it*; ſo are *all the Saints* in reſpect of the *deſert* of their *ſinnes*, the *leaſt* of them. But Gods *election* makes that which was *poſſible* in reſpect of the *merit* of *Paul*, and the other *Saints ſinnes*, *impoſſible* in reſpect of Chriſts *merits*, who purchaſed *pardoning*, *purging* and *preſerving* grace, for *all ſuch as the Father had given him*. *Pauls beating down his body*, was in order to the avoiding of thoſe ſins, which made him liable to be a *Caſt-away*, in regard of their *guilt*. It doth not ſtrike at all at the *certainty* of his *Election*, but God elected him *to this beating down* his *body*, as a *means* for the *ſaving* of his *ſoule*; and as God decreed to *ſave his ſoule*, ſo did he to *ſupply* him continually with *grace to beat down his body*. Here is in all this no acknowledgement of [*Pauls* being in a poſſibility of being made a Reprobate;] unleſſe perhaps you take *Reprobate* for *unworthy* ἀδόκιμος, *untried* or *unrefined*. And ſo indeed [he was in a poſſibility to be made a Reprobate.] unleſſe he had *beat down his body*. But this [poſſibility of his being ſuch a Reprobate,] through the corruption of his own *fleſh*, if left to it ſelf, was overcome by the decree of *election*, wherein God ordained to aſſiſt him with ſuch a meaſure of the *Spirit*, as ſhould maſter the *fleſh*; little is there in all this, of [a poſſibility of *Paul's* being a Reprobate] in the propet ſenſe, which, unleſſe it were *poſſible* that God ſhould change his *purpoſe*, could not be.

2. *Affirming* that this very text, which you quote, proves the confidence of St. *Paul*, that he could not miſcarrie, and that through the *grace of God*, and ſhewes the *certainty* of his *own* and *all Saints* Perſeverance. Nothing can ſeparate *them from the love of God*, i. e. not ſo much from their *love to God*, as *Gods love to them*; *the love of God which is in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord*; and this is as much as we contend for: but your gloſſe corrupts the text, when you ſay, [1. *Pauls* confidence was built, partly upon that clear and certain knowledge which he had of the unchangeable purpoſe of God, to give ſalvation unto all thoſe that ſhould perſevere in faith and holineſſe unto the end.] Saith the Apoſtle ſo? No, but he ſpeaks rather of Gods unchangeable purpoſe to *make them perſevere* in faith and holineſſe unto the end; without which ſure *death* and *life*, *Angels*, *Principalities* and *Powers*, were eaſily able to have diverted them from their courſe, notwithſtanding their own ſtrongeſt purpoſes and reſolutions. It is a *calling according to his purpoſe*, ver. 28. that is that which doth it, it is his purpoſe that ſtands, & in purſuance of it, he makes *all things work together for good to thoſe that love him*. 2. You do not too much right to the Text, when you ſay, [*Pauls* confidence was grounded, partly upon the like knowledge of the bounty of God towards all his Saints, in vouchſafing unto them ſo rich and full a proportion of means, as he doth whereby to perſevere.] Here is not a ſyllable of other means, *then the Love of God which is in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord*; it is out of *this love*, that God gives *inward grace* ſuitable to our temptations, without which all *outward means* would be too *mean*; it is the being of *God for us*, that

helps us, when all things are *againſt us*; without *this* all other *means* whatſoever, would be but *broken reeds*; ſaith *Paul*, *The Lord is able to make you ſtand* in one place, and *he will with the temptation give a way to eſcape, and he will preſerve me from every evil work unto his heavenly Kingdome*; and we *are kept by his power through faith to ſalvation*, and *he will fulfill all the good pleaſure of his goodneſſe, and the work of faith with power*. It is the *Power of God*, which he hath engaged for our preſervation, that alone holds up our hearts in *holineſſe*; and the conſideration of that is it alone which holds them up with *comfort*: No man that knowes his *own weakneſſe*, can hope to ſtand but by *Gods Power*, nor hope that Gods *Power* ſhould be employed to make him ſtand, but upon a knowledge of Gods *purpoſe*; nor have any knowledge of Gods *purpoſe*, to employ his power to make him ſtand, better then by ſeeing how all his own beſt parts are to *no purpoſe*, *none* of them ſufficient to keep him from *falling*, *moſt* of them apt to betray him to it, even to turne the *meanes* of his *ſtanding* into *occaſions* of his *falling*. When a Saint loathes his own *righteouſneſſe*, and *feares* his own *abilities*, then he may comfortably reflect on the *love of God*, which ſets his *Power*, *Wiſdom*, all a work for his preſervation: all our hope of our perſeverance in faith, is built on this, *God cannot break his faith*; though we *deny him*, he *remaineth faithful, and cannot deny himſelf*: As I all along diſcover the *weakneſſe*, ſo here I cannot but wonder at the *boldneſſe* of your Concluſion. [Thus then we ſee, the doctrine of falling away teaching only a poſſibility hereof, and ſo of periſhing, is no doctrine of uncomfortableneſſe, nor neceſſarily occaſioneth the leaſt feare in men of falling away or periſhing.] We poor men, who teach a certainty of the Saints perſeverance, are wont to bid them *feare themſelves*, though they *truſt God*; You, who deny this certainty of Perſeverance, ſay [your doctrine doth not neceſſarily occaſion the leaſt feare of falling away or periſhing;] it ſeems, though you be not ſo much for perſeverance, you are more for *aſſurance*; ſo confident are *you* of *your ſelf*, who take it ill, that *we* put ſo much confidence in *God*.

§. 22. Secondly, ſay you, [Suppoſe (for arguments ſake) the doctrine of Perſeverance, ſhould be ſubſcribed unto, and that abſolute aſſurance of ſalvation granted unto Believers, which this doctrine pretends to give unto them; yet will not that conditional aſſurance, which the other doctrine affords unto them, fall much ſhort of it, yea, in many reſpects, ſome whereof have been already touched, it will be found, in order to their comfort and peace, greater then it.]

I reply, 1. A man might think you ſpeak this but *in jeſt*; but why do you grant this [for Arguments ſake?] This is not, I trow, for [Arguments ſake,] but for the more bravery of your *Anſwers* ſake; but be it for the ſake of whatever you pleaſe. 2. What mean you by your [conditional aſſurance, in oppoſition to that of our doctrine?] do we *teach* an *abſolute* aſſurance of *ſalvation*, and not depending upon the *neceſſary condition* of *Perſeverance*? You wrong us; we ſay this *condition* indeed depends upon the good *pleaſure of God*, to work it in us in order to the execution of his decree of our ſalvation; we do not ſay, that it is the *pleaſure of God* to execute his decree of our ſalvation, without ſuch a perſeverance, which was from eternity *decreed* by him, and is accordingly in time *wrought* by him, in all ſuch as he hath decreed to ſave. Well, let us trie, how you will prove your [conditional aſſurance of ſalvation] which is of ſalvation, to be obtained by a [mans employing of the means, which God gives him for Perſeverance, to be as comfortable as ours,] which is of *Gods imploying his own power*, to make us continue in the *uſe* of *the meanes* which he hath given us for Perſeverance. Unleſſe you performe *this*, you do as good as *nothing*. But let us hear what you will do.

[Put caſe, (ſay you,) I were a man who very much deſired to live long in the world, and God ſhould pleaſe to grant me a Leaſe or aſſurance of my life, for a thouſand years, only upon condition, that I ſhould not wilfully deſtroy my ſelf, as either by thruſting a ſword through mine own bowels, or by caſting my ſelf headlong from ſome high tower, or by taking poiſon known to me for ſuch before-hand, with the like; would I not upon the matter be as well ſatisfied with ſuch a conditional Leaſe, or grant,

grant, as this, as with one that ſhould be abſolute, and wherein my life ſhould be aſſured unto me, againſt all poſſible attempts, to be made by my ſelf to deſtroy it? Doubtleſſe, if it were ſimply long life that I deſired, the former grant would be as ſatisfactory unto me as the latter; indeed, if beſides the ſecurity of my life, and of the continuance of it for ſuch a time, I ſhould wantonly or vain-gloriouſly deſire to ſhew deſperate tricks, without feare or danger, as to take Lions by the beards, or Beares by the pawes, or tread upon Cockatrices, to waſh in Cauldrons of boyling lead, or the like; then the latter grant would accommodate me better then the former. In like manner, if it be ſimply and ſingly the ſalvation of my ſoule which I deſire, and the certainty or aſſurance hereof; ſuch a conditional promiſe made unto me by God as this, that ſaved I ſhall certainly be, if I will but quit my ſelf like a man, abſtain from fooliſh luſts, and not with the *dog return again to my vomit*, or with the *ſwine which hath been waſhed to my wallowing in the mire*; ſuch a promiſe, I ſay, as this, is ſecurity unto me in abundance, in that behalf. But if my deſire be over and above the ſaving of my ſoule, to live looſely and prophanely, to diſport my ſelf in all manner of wickedneſſe, to affront the Heavens, bid defiance to the Almighty, and laugh Jeſus Chriſt and his Goſpel in the face to ſcorn, or the like, without running the hazard of loſing my ſoule, then I confeſſe only ſuch a grant or promiſe of ſalvation from God, as the doctrine of abſolute Perſeverance demands, would ſatisfie and content me, and furniſh me with that aſſurance which I deſire; ſo that it is evident, our doctrine hath as much comfort in it as the contrary, and indulgeth as much unto the Saints, but only a liberty or fearleſneſſe of ſinning And whether men may not be of a free, ingenuous and ſon-like ſpirit, without a liberty or boldneſſe of ſinning; yea, whether ſuch a liberty as this will conſiſt with that ſpirit, I freely refer to the determination of any man, who hath been never ſo little baptized into the Spirit, whereby the Saints cry, *Abba, Father.*]

I anſwer, and begin with the *ſubſtance* of what you ſay, and thence ſhall proceed to the *ſimile*, whereby you illuſtrate it: for the firſt then, 1. Such a [conditional promiſe made unto you by God, as this, *You ſhall be certainly ſaved, if you will but acquit your ſelf like a man, abſtain from fooliſh luſts, &c*] will give you ſorry aſſurance, if you be not more then *any man living*; for who, I pray, can *ſo abſtain* from fooliſh luſts, as not to be *ſometimes overtaken*? and *every time* he is *overtaken*, he is like to be *over ſhoes, over boots, head* and *eares*, if God do not by his *Spirit* pluck him out. What is become of the *comfort* of ſuch a *promiſe*? yea, who is there that will ſo [acquit himſelf like a man,] as not to [return with the *dog* and *ſwine* to his *vomit* and *wallowing in the mire*,] if God do not hold him back? the *beſt Saints* will readily confeſſe this againſt themſelves; they who are more then *ordinary men*, how ſoon would they prove but *reaſonable beaſts*; did not God interpoſe by *his Spirit*, and graciouſly reſtrain them? hitherto then your promiſe gives but a *miſerable comfort*. 2. The doctrine of Perſeverance doth not [demand any promiſe of ſalvation, with a diſpenſation to diſport our ſelves in all manner of wickedneſſe, to bid defiance to the Almighty, &c.] Conſider but what is *ſalvation*, and he that *deſires that*, muſt needs *deſie* ſuch a liberty as this you pretend [the doctrine of Perſeverance demands.] *Salvation* is a *freedome* from *ſinne* as well as *ſuffering*; it is a *filling us* with *wiſdom* and *holineſſe*, with *grace* in its *exaltation to glory*. Now whoever *deſires* this, muſt needs *deteſt* all manner of *wickedneſſe*, as being diametrically oppoſite to it. *Salvation* is in being admitted to a *full joy in the preſence of God*; therefore [he who *deſires* this, muſt needs hate *ſporting* in any manner of wickedneſſe.] *Salvation* is in *delighting in the viſion of God*; therefore he who *deſires this*, muſt needs *abominate* [defying of God.] *Salvation* is in *enjoying Chriſt*, he therefore who *deſires* this, muſt needs *abhorre* [laughing Chriſt and his Goſpel in the face.] The *loſing* of the *ſoule* is the loſſe of *holineſſe*, the *ſight of God* and *Chriſt*, and a being left to its own corruptions to be *tranſported* by them, and to be *vexed* with the *conſcience* of *them*. It is impoſſible that any man ſhould deſire to *gain ſalvation*, or *not loſe his ſoule*, and deſire withal to have a *liberty* to be like *a beaſt*, yea, *a devil*; theſe are meer *ἀνοήματα*. 3. It is an abſurdity of the firſt magnitude, to ſay,

[the doctrine of Perſeverance, indulgeth unto the Saints a liberty or fearleſneſſe of ſinning;] how can they be *Saints* if they have ſuch a [liberty or fearleſneſſe of ſinning?] This is to ſay, it indulgeth to the *Saints* not to be *Saints*. The doctrine of Perſeverance gives aſſurance to the Saints, they ſhall *continue Saints*, and be *preſerved* from [allowing themſelves ſuch a liberty, or fearleſneſſe of ſinning.] This is the tenour of it, that *God will keep them from every evil work unto his heavenly Kingdome*; that his Kingdome ſhall be *ſet up within them*, and not be *taken from them*: that is, that they ſhall perſevere in *righteouſneſſe and holineſſe*; and not *run with others to the exceſſe of riot*; that when they ſtep, yea, look that way, God will mercifully draw them back again, and make them *walk the more circumſpectly*, and *work out their ſalvation with the more feare and trembling*. Thus the *ſubſtance* of what you have ſaid, is but ſo much *ſmoke*.

2. What is your *Illuſtration?*

1. [A Leaſe of your life for a thouſand years (as you fancie) upon condition you ſhould not run your ſelf through with a ſword, nor caſt your ſelf from an high tower, nor take poiſon which you know to be ſuch before-hand, or the like,] would be *ſhort* of the ſecurity, that God gives the Saints for *ſalvation*; for had they but ſuch ſecurity as this, they might die, though by falling *caſually* [upon a ſword, or from a tower, and by drinking poiſon,] which they *knew not* to be ſuch; many a poiſon may be given them in their *meat* and *drink*, yea, in their *Phyſick*; and though they pluck not [Lions by the beards, or Beares by the pawes,] yet the *Lion* would often enough tear them as the *Aſſe*, and the Beare as a *Kid*. Though they did not [tread upon Cockatrices,] yet the Cockatrice would too often *ſting* them; and though they took no [pleaſure to waſh in Cauldrons of boyling lead,] yet would they be in danger enough of having *ſcalding water ſpilt* upon them.

2. No *men* have any thing *within them* to *tempt* them to ſuch [playing with Lions and Beares, and treading on Cockatrices, waſhing in boyling lead;] theſe have *nothing in them* to tempt men to ſuch ſports; but the *perilous pleaſures of ſin*, have *too much* to *bewitch* men; and the *beſt men* too much to *beguile* them to them: too little to *detain* them from them, [a ſecurity given you for your *natural life*,] till you were weary of it, would be *ſufficient*; but ſuch a ſecurity for *ſpiritual life* would be a *ſorry one*. Alas, good Sir, there is that in the beſt of Saints, which is *ſick of this life*, which *loves death*; this *ſpiritual life* is indeed a *dying to ſinne*, a *mortifying*, *crucifying* of it, and in *every Saint* there is too *great* a part, which *hates* this *life* to the very *death*. Did God only leave us to our ſelves, [to enjoy it as long as we liſt,] how ſoon ſhould every one of us long to be *rid* of it? No [Saint cries, *Abba*, *Father*,] but he acknowledges he owes his Father, not more for the *beginning*, then the *preſervation* of his *ſpiritual life*, which he had many a time *caſt away*, had not his *Father* prevented it. Many a time had he [plaid upon the Cockatrices den,] and *fallen* into it in *ſport*, and left the dull ſociety of *Lambs*, to recreate himſelf with the [Lion and Beare,] and thought they meant him no *harme*, when they [pluck] him by the [throat,] yea, thought he did himſelf *honour* when he caſt himſelf at their *mercy*. This is the happineſſe of the children of God, that when they begin to play *rude ſports* with ſuch *edge-tooles*, and God ſuffers them to cut their *fingers*, yet he *whips* them for it, yea, makes their *hearts bleed*, and all little enough to *ſave their lives*.

3. [That doctrine which is efficacious, and proper to cut off and prevent all thoſe occaſions and miſcarriages, from which the troubles of conſcience, doubtings of ſalvation, fears of periſhing, &c. do moſt frequently, if not alwayes ariſe, muſt needs be a doctrine of farre better comportance, with the peace and comfort of men, then that which is apt to multiply, or to give being to ſuch occaſions. Now]

1. That the unclean iſſues of luſts and corruptions, in the lives and wayes of men, are the ſprings and fountaines, that commonly ſend forth the bitter waters of inward troubles, feares and perplexities in the ſoule, hath been already argued in this chapter, and is nothing but what daily experience of too many ſealeth unto for truth.]

truth.] I ſhall not oppoſe *hitherto*. But what doth this *oppoſe* us? it is but a *vapour* that [you have proved out doctrine of aſſurance guilty of begetting feares and perplexities, by opening the fountains of luſts and corruptions.]

2. [It hath been likewiſe brought forth into a clear light, that the doctrine of abſolute Perſeverance is of as pregnant and dangerous a calculation, as a doctrine lightly can be, to cauſe the lives and wayes of men to abound with thoſe unclean iſſues we ſpeak of.] I know not what you mean by a [doctrine of abſolute Perſeverance,] what of Perſeverance in the grace and favour of God, and certainty of ſalvation amidſt all debauchedneſſe, defiance of God and men, &c. our doctrine never learned to ſpeak thus. Such a doctrine as *this* would abſurdly contradict *it ſelfe*; bid men take *comfort* in *expecting* what is contrary to that wherein it placeth its *comfort*; *expect comfort* in being ſaved from *ſinne*, and inſtated into *perfect holineſſe* in heaven; and *take comfort* in their liberty to run to the height of *wickedneſſe* on earth. Our doctrine of Perſeverance teacheth men to expect as their greateſt *happineſſe*, a *victory over their luſts*, therefore bids them not *delight* or *allow themſelves* to *inſlave themſelves* to them.

3. You here adde, [that the contrary doctrine, (meaning of conditional Perſeverance) is of a kindly temper, of a moſt abſolute, choice and proper conſtitution, to prevent the breakings out of ſuch iſſues; to amate the courage, and to break the heart of thoſe corruptions in men, which otherwiſe would be very unruly, and hardly beare reſtraint, and conſequently is a faithful and ſevere Guardian over the peace and comforts of men, for teaching on the *one* hand, a certainty of Perſeverance and ſalvation thereupon, upon a conſciencious uſe of thoſe meanes, which God hath preſcribed in order thereunto; I mean, ſay you, for the inabling men to perſevere, it mightily cheareth, fortifieth and ſtrengtheneth the ſpirit of man, who deſireth (as hath been proved,) neither Perſeverance nor ſalvation it ſelf, upon any other termes then theſe; and rejoyceth above meaſure, that upon theſe they may and ſhall moſt aſſuredly be had. And on the other hand, by teaching, that by looſeneſſe, prophaneneſſe and negligence in the uſe of means, &c. there may be an apoſtatizing to perdition, it ſorely rebukes the fleſh and corruption in a man, and puts a ſharp bit and bridle into their lips. A *Briale*, (ſaith *Solomon*,) *for the Aſſe*, and *a rod for the fooles back*: the terrible rod of hell-fire, is for the back of that *great foole* the *fleſh*, or that which is *irrational* or *unruly* in men; without the ſhaking and ſound whereof, it will hardly learn ſubjection.]

I anſwer, I have found at laſt, what it was that made you commend your doctrine before, for a [Nurſe to the ſoules peace and comfort,] that which now beſpeaks it, for [a faithful and ſevere Guardian to it, as a choice, abſolute and proper conſtitution, whereby it is enabled to reſtrain theſe corruptions.] But

1. As farre forth as it is [chearing to the ſpirit,] it is but by what it borrowes of *our doctrine of Perſeverance*, teaching a certainty of Perſeverance and ſalvation thereupon, upon a [conſciencious uſe of thoſe means, which God hath preſcribed in order thereunto:] This is almoſt *our doctrine*, only a little *ſoured*; firſt, with an ingredient of I know not what, [a certainty of Perſeverance and ſalvation thereupon, upon a conſciencious uſe of thoſe means which God hath preſcribed in order thereunto;] whereunto, I pray, doth this [upon a conſciencious uſe of thoſe meanes which God hath preſcribed in order thereunto] relate? to *ſalvation*? it is the ſame we ſay; to *certainty of ſalvation*? it is the ſame we ſay ſtill. But what? to *Perſeverance*? that is *your own*: Your doctrine teacheth [that men ſhall perſevere upon a conſcientious uſe of the meanes, preſcribed by God in order thereunto.] Upon how long a [conſciencious uſe of thoſe means] I pray? If *conſtant* [conſciencious uſe of them] till *death*, then the ſenſe, is *men ſhall perſevere upon condition they ſhall perſevere*; and this ſenſe is as good as none. If [upon a conſciencious uſe of them] for any time *before death*, then it ſeems afterwards they may *perſevere*, though they do *not perſevere*: and this is your [choice and comfortable notion.] *We* ſay, God gives men aſſurance of *ſalvation*, upon a conſciencious *Perſeverance* in the uſe of the meanes, preſcribed in order *thereto*; but withal, that he gives us affurance, that

he

he will *help* us to *perſevere* in the uſe of theſe meanes; we are conſcious to our *ſelves*, how *often* we *fall*, how *unable* we ſhould be at any *time* to *riſe*. Our comfort is, God will keep us, if not from *falling down*, yet from *lying long* in our corruptions; and will help us to *riſe*, yea, *lift us* up upon ſuch termes, as to make us *ſtand* the more *ſteadily*, and walk the more *warily* afterward. The ſpirit of man deſireth better aſſurance of Perſeverance and ſalvation then you give the man, or it is *content* with very *little*. *Alas*, let God but leave us in the *hand of our own counſels* for one *moment*, after all our [conſciencious uſe of the means] preſcribed by him in order to our ſalvation, what will become of us? Our *comfort* lies in this, that *God keeps us in his hand*, and will not permit any power *to pluck us out of it*; and he keeps our very *feet*, and though he leave us to *ſlide*, to ſhew us what we are of our *ſelves*, yet he *ſtayes our ſlidings*, that we ſhall not *fall* ſo miſerably as elſe we would do on the *faireſt* ground. Here lies *our comfort*, that he will *guide us* ſtill *by his counſel*, and ſo at *laſt receive us to his glory*: that he who keeps us, neither *ſlumbers* nor *ſleepes*; that he is with us in our *goings out* and *comings in*, in *our lyings down* and *riſings up*, and though when he *turnes away his face*, poor wretches, we *die*, as it were, for the *time*, and are ready to return to the *duſt*, all out *good thoughts do periſh*, yet he *ſends forth his Spirit*, and we are *made*, and he *renewes the face* of our ſouls, which looked like *earth*. Here is our *comfort*, that when he ſuffers us to *ſleep*, he himſelf *ſlumbers not*, but *watcheth* over us, and in his good time graciouſly *awakens us*, and bids us *ſtand up as from the dead*, and *gives us light again*, that when he ſuffers us to *ſlip*, yet he continueth in his *ſteadineſſe*; *he changeth not, and therefore are We not conſumed*: our *comfort* lies all in all in Gods *ſupport*. Your doctrine in ſtead of this *ſtaffe*, gives the poor ſoul a pretty *reed* to lean upon for its *comfort*.

2. Whereas you commend your doctrine, [for that it teacheth, that by looſeneſſe, prophaneneſſe, negligence in the uſe of means, &c. there may be an apoſtatizing to perdition, and ſo ſorely rebuketh the fleſh;] what I pray ſaith it in this particular more then *ours*? it over and over *renounces* what you *impoſe* on it, as if it [taught a certainty of ſalvation, under the moſt incredible extremity of lewdneſſe and impiety,] it ſpeaks as much as *yours* for its life, that there may be [by looſeneſſe, prophaneneſſe, negligence an apoſtatizing to perdition,] yea a great deal *more*; it ſaith, *this is apoſtatizing to perdition*; only it ſaith, no man that is *once regenerate*, is permitted *thus to apoſtatize*: not but that he *may fall* into theſe [looſeneſſe, prophaneneſſe more then negligence,] but that is a *fit*, wherein he is not *himſelf*. Thus

Nullum grande ingenium ſine mixturâ dementiæ.

But by the grace of God he ſoon recovers, and is what he was before, a hater of the [looſeneſſe, prophaneneſſe, negligence, &c.] and ſo much the more for the *hurt* he received by them. Now *what indignation? what zeale?* yea, *what revenge? Multis fuit utile vinci.* Their *foile* ſet an *edge* on their *valour*, ſo is it with the *Saints*, ſaith our doctrine: they may be betrayed to ſome [looſeneſſe, prophaneneſſe, negligence, &c.] by the *fleſh*, but then when by the *grace of God* they *diſcover* it, they make their *fleſh* pay for it for *ever after*; put the greater *bridle* into its *lips*, and *fall* with the ſharper *rod* on its *back*, and not only on that which is [irrational in them] as you ſpeak, but on their very *reaſon* it ſelf, and *captivates it to the obedience of Chriſt*. You think, it ſeems, the *Reaſon* of man is *all ſpirit*, I wis, this is *fleſh* too till it be *ſpiritualized*, and is more *unruly* then the *inferior faculties*: ſo much *more* as it pretends to *know more*, and takes upon it to *ſpeak more*, it playes the *fool* more *ingeniouſly* and more *pompouſly* then the reſt. The Saints lay the *rod* on the back of this *proud foole*. It is not (they well know) the [ſhaking and ſound of it] that will teach it ſubjection; whereas you ſay it [will hardly learn ſubjection without theſe,] the Saints finde it will not at all learn it *by theſe*, without many a *ſore blow*. They therefore lay the rod on the *back*, yea, the *face* of this *fool*, and are fain to ſtrike its

eyes

eyes black and blew, as it were to *pull them out*, till ſhe will yield to be ruled, but do you think the [irrational part of man] will ever be [taught ſubjection by ſhaking of rods,] yea, by any leſſon you can teach it with a *rod* in your *hand*, and ever anon on its *back*? it is never [brought to ſubjection by teaching,] but by *force*. *Threats* will not do it; the *irrational*, yea, the *rational* part of man *unſanctified*, is never [brought into ſubjection] by any *feare*; *outward actings* may be *reſtrained*, the *reſtraint* of *outward* is the *redounding* of *inward*; it is the *Spirits* work (to *keep down* the *fleſh*) and *unregenerate* part, it never *did* nor *will* learn ſubjection; ſaith the Apoſtle, *It neither is ſubject to the law of God*, nor *indeed can be*; ſo then *our* Doctrine lifts up the ſpirit by *holy hope*, not without many *feares*, but of the *riſings* of the *fleſh* to its *diſhonour*, *diſcomfort*, *diſtraction*; but *yours* which thinks to do ſuch feats on fleſh by *fear*, forgets what kinde of beaſt that [aſſe] is, it hath not wit enough to *fear beating*, and *longer* then it *feels the rod*, it doth not *minde* it, and *when* it *feels* it, it mindes not what it *means*, and will in ſpite hold on its old pace; as the *Spaniſh* beggar ſaid, not alter it for *all the whipping in Paris*.

[If it be objected, (ſay you) Yea, but experience ſheweth, that the contrary doctrine, *viz.* that which maintaines unconditioned perſeverance, is more effectual to ſubdue corruption in men, then the other; in as much as many who maintain the Doctrine of falling away, are known to be looſe, and of ſinful addiction in ſeveral kindes, to be no friends to the power of Religion, &c. whereas men of greateſt holineſſe, and ſtrictneſſe of converſation, are knowne to be of the contrary judgement; To this alſo I anſwer.]

Before I examine your Anſwer, I muſt be bold to tell you,

1. That *we* maintain not ſuch an [unconditioned perſeverance] as you put upon us, [that men ſhould continue ſure of coming to heaven, without walking in wayes of holineſſe, yea, while they run to all exceſſe of riot;] it is your pleaſure to impoſe *this* on *our* doctrine; *our* doctrines do as juſtly *abhorre* this fancy, as you injuriouſly charge it upon her, while ſhe ſpeaks of [abſolute ſalvation of the Saints:] ſhe intends by *abſolute* free from *confuſion*, not free from *conditions* of *obedience*, but is bold to ſay, God hath abſolutely decreed to give his Saints this bleſſed condition, and to keep them from *ſin* on *earth*, as well as crown them with *glory* & happines in *heaven*.

2. That we lay no great weight on the [looſeneſſe of the adverſaries of our doctrine,] nor on the [ſtrictneſſe of the profeſſors of it.] If any of our ſide uſe this as an argument of the *truth* of our doctrine, and the *falſhood* of the contrary; they uſe it but *ad populum*, as a *plauſible probability*; not *ad eruditos*, as a *convincing demonſtration*: alas, we know *too many* have maintained the *truth* in the *Schooles* and *Churches*, and yet *denied* it in their *converſation*; and *many* who have been *lewd* in their *opinions*, have been *blameleſſe* enough in their *converſation*; and have done the *more miſchief* by demeaning themſelves in a *fair way* of exemplary *civility*, and ſuppoſed *ſanctimonioufneſſe*; yet to me it ſeems not *probable*, that the *generality* of thoſe who are *vicious* in their *practice*, ſhould be *orthodox* in their *Tenets*, or that the *generality* of thoſe who are *upright* in their *lives*, ſhould go *wrong* in their *doctrines*. Now to your Anſwer: You ſay firſt in a pretty bravado [that the maintainers of the Apoſtaſie of the Saints, need count it no robbery, to be every way equall in the honour of holineſſe, with their oppoſers; and that the truth is, if it were lawful for you to utter, what you really apprehend and judge in this caſe, you do not finde the Spirit of holineſſe, to breath with that authority, heat, or excellency of power, in the writings of the latter, which you are very ſenſible of in the writings of the former.] I dare be bold to ſay that the writings of *one Calvin*, are able to blow down all thoſe of all the *Arminians* in the world; It was no great Hyperbole, that he uſed, who ſaid of *Calvins Inſtitutions*.

Præter Apoſtolicas, poſt Chriſti tempora, chartas,
Hnic peperere libro, ſecula nulla parem.

How doth his holy pen all along *drop*, as it were, the *dew* of *heaven* on the ſad ſpi-

rit of every *ſanctified Reader*? how doth it *rain fire* and *brimſtone* on the heart of every *profane worldling*; and as it were ſtrike through the loines of a carnal, or formal profeſſor? what *Beza* ſaid of *Luthers*, may be as truly applied to *Calvins* ſtile;

Luther ad hunc calamum, ferrea clava nihil.
Roma orbem domuit, Romam ſibi Papa ſubegit,
Viribus illa ſuis, fraudibus iſte ſuis.
Quanto illâ major Lutherus, *major & iſto,*
Illam iſtúmque, uno qui domuit calamo?

It were to *diſhonour Calvin*, but to preferre him before *Arminius*, *Bertius*, *Tilenus*, *Tomſon*, and the reſt of your pious Advocates for Apoſtaſie; there are none of them worthy to be named in the ſame page with him. Yea, to paſſe by *Calvin*, whoſe *Comments* ſeem to be dictated by the ſame Spirit, that indited the *Text*; what think you of *Dod*, *Dent*, *Dike*, *Bolton*, *Preſton*, *Sibs*? (to name no others now alive) how doth the Spirit of holineſſe blow with a continual gale in their writings, when as at moſt, there are but light puffes of it to be found in the beſt ſcriblings of your *Arminian Rabbies*? That which you ſay [checks the authority of their demands for righteouſneſſe, and holineſſe] doth but *reflect* them ſo as to fall with the more force and efficacie on the heart of the Reader, and is ſo far from [cutting the ſtronger ſinnews of their motives] that it *ſtrengthens* them, to run ſo much the more unmatchably; we need not fear to compare theſe, and other latter mens writings, with thoſe of the *Fathers* of the firſt 300. yeares, who *you* pretend [were all for the Apoſtaſie of the Saints,] how juſtly, ſhall be examined in your 15. Chapter: in the mean time we deny [thoſe Writers are of your ſide,] and ſay, that *thoſe on our ſide*, want nothing to *Saint them*, but that they lived not in the *former ages*; ſure they are as much *before many* of thoſe Saints in *holineſſe*, as they come *behinde* them in *time*. I may truly ſay, that as the myſtery of iniquity began to work betimes, ſo the myſtery of godlineſſe was never ſo fully diſcovered as of late.

§. 25. You come to ſpeak of latter Divines whom you rank into three Claſſes; in the firſt you put [*Calvin*, *Muſculus*, *Peter Martyr*, *Bucer*, *&c.*] and would bear us in hand [they were not ſo fully ſetled in their judgement, for the doctrine of abſolute perſeverance, as is conceived;] how much you abuſe *them* and *us* in this your miſrepreſentation of them, ſhall be ſhewed in its due place in your 15. Chapter.

In the ſecond rank you put [the Ancient Worthies of our *Engliſh* Church] and pretend [they had two Nations in their wombs, and that where they ſpeak one word for us, they let fall another for you] this is ſaid, not proved and we hope ſhall be fully diſproved in its place, Chap. 15.

In the third liſt you put [thoſe godly Miniſters now upon the ſtage,] and tell us how in [their uſes they pull down that faith, which they eſſay to build up in their doctrine] *aratem habent*, and I leave them to ſpeak for themſelves; onely whereas [you prognoſticate the fall of the doctrine of perſeverance,] I am bold [to affirm, that your miſtake of the *riſing* of it, is a ſufficient aſſurance to me you are not infallible in your prediction of the *ruine* of it; and that you may well be at a fault in foretelling its death, not having rightly calculated its *nativity*. Who but Mr. *Goodwin*, queſtionleſſe a ſinguler zealot for Reverend *Perkins*, would have honoured his name ſo farre, as to have aſcribed [the general reception of the doctrine of perſeverance onely to the great Reputation which he worthily bare in our Engliſh world?] alas, many received that doctrine who did little value Mr. *Perkins*; you tell us [the Tranſlators bowed the Text to make it comply with this doctrin:] ſure they would not generally have bended their *heads* to Mr. *Perkins*, but this doctrin prevailed with all ſorts of meu of all parties: nor was *this doctrine* honoured for Mr. *Perkins*, but Mr. *Perkins* was reverenced by the godly for his clear and dexterous explication of *this doctrine*; though the *people* may take up *doctrines* upon the credit of a *man*, the *learned* eſteem the *man* for his *doctrine*, and this is ſuch a *doctrine*, that though *your ſelfe* have ſet againſt it, armed with as much *authority* among multitudes in the Nation, as Mr. *Perkins* was,

and

and with more *favour* of ſome in authority, yet do not we fear, leſt *your name* ſhould prevail with the godly learned, to perſwade them, that the [*names of the Saints may be blotted out of Gods book*;] write as many *books* as you pleaſe to that purpoſe; yea, though *an Angell from heaven*, ſhould give an atteſtation to it, they would be bold to ſay that Angel *preached another Goſpel*, *and let him be* ——Having thus ſlurred the Advocates for perſeverance, as [not ſufficiently conſtant to themſelves,] you proceed next to tell us, that [were they never ſo conſtant in their judgement in this particular, this had no ſuch ſpecial influence on the holineſſe of their lives, but that they muſt rather thank ſundry other principles; this was not any wayes acceſſory to their godlineſſe;] but were this of ſuch a malignant nature, as you have pleaſed to render it, it would have ſo poiſoned the ſpirits of their godlineſſe, that no [other principles] could have been a ſufficient Antidote. I ſhall in due place ſhew, that aſſurance of ſalvation is the chief incentive to holineſſe, preſervative againſt temptations, corroſive of luſts, and ſhortly, that *this hope* makes men *purifie themſelves*, *even as God is pure*.

For the preſent, I am to conſider what you ſay concerning [the perſons chiefly intended in the objection] pretended to be [made againſt your doctrine, *viz.* the worſt of the late Biſhops ſuch as Romanized, and Tyrannized moſt amongſt them; together with their Clergy-creatures, and Favourites, who generally inclined to the doctrine of falling away; and withall, took more liberty in their lives, then men truly Religious ought to have done] But this you ſay was [occaſioned by other principles, not this doctrine of Apoſtaſie.] This is an argument I am unwilling to meddle with, *Ab hac ſcabie tenemus ungues*. I yield the faults of the *profeſſor*, are not alwayes chargeable on the *doctrine* he profeſſeth, elſe what would become of Chriſtianity? But when you ſay that [Atheiſme, and Polytheiſme, are not the better, though the profeſſors of either of theſe opinions, have quitted themſelves upon better terms of honour and reputation in their lives, then many Chriſtians,] I muſt tell you, 1. That had the *generality* of Chriſtians, quitted themſelves no better, then the *generality* of Atheiſts, and Polytheiſts, your inſtance had been pertinent; this not being ſo, it is litttle to the purpoſe. 2. That the Chriſtians who do ſo, [ill acquit themſelves] what ever they be in their *profeſſion*, are in their *opinion* Atheiſts, or Polytheiſts, and being *Polytheiſts*, are indeed *Atheiſts*, but we have the charity to think that almoſt *all* that profeſſe the doctrine of Apoſtaſie, do hold what they *profeſſe*; and perhaps *ſome* of them hold it upon the conſciouſneſſe of *their own falling*, though but from a *faint profeſſion* of godlineſſe. And whereas you gravely tell us out of Sir *Francis Bacon* [that Atheiſme never perturbed States; for it makes men wary of themſelves, as looking no further:] I muſt needs ſay, Atheiſme is very much obliged to you, for giving ſo fair a character of it, enough to commend it to a high place, in the affections of States-men, as being of a [quiet, peaceable ſpirit;] whereas Chriſtian Religion, it ſeems, is more *froward* and *turbulent*, and in that reſpect doth not deſerve ſo much countenance from *Authority*. But I am afraid when it comes to be examined, it will appear, that Atheiſme is no way guilty of this your commendation, but hath been all along the great *incendiary* of States; only ſhe hath had the Art to *blow the coales*, ſo as to ſeem to do it with the *breath* of *Religion*; Religion is firſt *pure*, *then peaceable*. All [diſturbance of States,] is from a *civil Atheiſme*, as one ſaid, a denying thoſe of whom God ſaid, *Ye are gods*; and where men deny there is a *God in heaven*: they never ſubmit out of conſcience to the *Deputy-gods on earth*; but Chriſtian Religion preſſeth *this*, as an eſpecial duty, to be *ſubject not only for wrath*, *but alſo for conſcience ſake*. Sir, I may truly ſay, that Chriſtian Religion never [perturbed States] but *by accident*; as it occaſioned a rage and fury in the hearts of *Atheiſts* or *Idolaters*; *theſe* are they that are the grand *Bouteſeus*; and they are ſo much the more Atheiſts, as they pretend *Religion* to colour their *ſeditions inſurrections*. Thus I hope Atheiſme is not like to receive ſo much thanks, for its *meekneſſe* as you pretend it is worthy of; and the reaſon you bring to prove it [free from this offence of perturbing of States] is ſuch, as will not prove it, *viz.* [that it makes men wary of themſelves, as looking no further;] for, 1. Atheiſme is apt to make men *leſſe* [wary of themſelves,] as telling them, they are in no §. 26.

danger after *this preſent life*; and 2. The more it [makes men look to themſelves] the leſſe it makes them fearful of [perturbing States] if they may obtain eaſe to *themſelves*, by *diſturbing* others; and raiſe their *private fortunes* on the *publick ruines*. And whence I pray comes all [perturbing of States,] but from mens ſeeking *themſelves*, and their *own* advantage, though by the confuſion of others? what you adde of [the Biſhops creatures politick deſigne in maintaining the doctrine of Apoſtaſie] though it be more then you can aſſure us, as I ſuppoſe, not having been of *their Counſel*, yet I am content to yield, as making thus farre for us, that it inferres the *Puritans* were *generally* for the *doctrine of perſeverance*, ſeeing [the Epiſcopalians oppoſed that doctrine, in hatred of the Puritans.] That which you cloſe all with, that [the Cathedral generation embraced the doctrine of Apoſtaſie, out of their generall reverence of *Auſtin*,] is meerly ſaid; *Auſtin* (ſay we) was the *great Patron* of our Doctrine, and you tell us [Mr. *Prime* ſaith, *He wonders how any man that hath peruſed* Auſtin, *can have the boldneſſe to affirme the contrary*; whether the paſſages which you quote out of *Auſtin*, will demonſtrate [this ſpeech of Mr. *Prinnes* to have never a graine of modeſty in it] ſhall be examined in its turn.

§. 27. In the mean time I ſhall take into conſideration what you ſubjoyn againſt what the aſſertors of the doctrin of perſeverance are, as you ſay, wont to affirm, I am afraid upon too unhappy experience; [that they never knew any, who fell in with your opinion, but they declined in Religion;] ſurely it hath been too true an obſervation in *many of them*, who have from *conſtant Preachers*, become *idle drones*, and from *zealous profeſſors*, *lukewarm*; yea, *cold practitioners* of holy *duties*. Whereas you ſay, [Such an allegation as this, much reſembleth the ſuperſtitious advice of thoſe who diſſwade the marriages of couſin-Germans, upon the account of this obſervation of theirs, that ſuch have never proſpered:] I muſt reply, this of [couſin-Germans marriages] is nothing a *kin* to the caſe of embracing the doctrine of Apoſtaſie, 1. There being *nothing* in the *nature* of ſuch marriages as ſhould render them *unhappy*, there being *very much* in the *Genius* of the doctrine of Apoſtaſie, to turn the maintainers of it out of the *way of holineſſe*. The *dependance upon a divine decree* for our preſervation, leads us to a *ſenſe* of our *weakneſſe* and *corruption*, and jealouſie over *them*, which would be too ſure to *betray* us to eternal *deſtruction*, were we not ſupported by the *immediate hand of God*, and he who thinks not *this alone* able to keep him, but that he can ſufficiently keep *himſelfe*, as you ſhew next, [being aſſiſted onely by a *general grace*] or rather *outward meanes of it*, is in a fair way to *fall*, thinking he may *ſtand* by *his own ſtrength*. 2. There being, I fear, a *more generall declining* from the *wayes of holineſſe*, to be obſerved in the maintainers of the doctrine of Apoſtaſie, then [*unhappineſſe in the marriages of couſin-Germans*;] albeit [one Swallow doth not make a Summer] as you ſay [nor one Woodcock a Winter,] yet the *coldeſt Summer* is ever wont to abound with *multitudes* of *Swallowes*, & the *warmeſt Winter* with a ſufficient number of *Woodcocks*; and ſo this *doctrine* of Apoſtaſie is *commonly attended* with an Apoſtaſie in *practice* in *moſt* of the defenders of it. Albeit ſome ſuch happy men, as Mr. *Goodwin*, may retain their priſtine ardor in holineſſe, the *major part* of your confederates have not much to boaſt of in this kinde; if any of them have, they may well be reckoned among the *nigróque ſimillima cigno*.

§. 28. You tack about next to the old point, to vindicate your doctrine from the aſperſion of *uncomfortableneſſe*, and will needs bear us in hand that [there is almoſt the ſame conſideration of a Saints refraining from ſin, and of a mans forbearing to deſtroy his natural life, by wilful precipitation, poiſoning himſelf, or the like; and that the inclination which is in men, to preſerve their natural life, is not much more potent, vigorous, and active, then that in the Saints, to forbear ſins; at leaſt of ſuch a ſize, as may betray them to damnation.]

§. 26. And firſt, you tell us that [even the natural inclination in men, to preſerve their lives, is not ſo ſtrong, but that many times they lay violent hands on themſelves.] This to my ſeeming makes *little for your advantage*, for if that ſtrong *deſire of life*, and *abhorrency of death*, which *nature* hath implanted in *every mans* breaſt, be not able to prevail with *many* ſo farre, as to reſtrain them from caſting themſelves away, and to

grow

grow *weary of life*, upon trivial matters of diſcontent; as we have known ſome that have *killed themſelves*, onely becauſe they could not *pleaſe others*, and have cut their own *throats*, becauſe they could not embrace anothers *boſome*: Some that have thrown away their *lives*, becauſe they could not retain ſome inconſiderable part of their *livings*; ſome that have *ſtrangled themſelves*, becauſe they could not have ſuch a proportion as they deſired of the *breath* of *applauſe*; ſome that have *murthered themſelves*, becauſe they could not be *revenged on another*, and have embrued their hands in their *own blood*, becauſe they were not long enough to reach their *enemies*; I ſay, if the *ſtrong natural deſire* of *life* were ſo eaſily overcome by ſuch *weak temptations*, what wonder is it if the Saints love of *ſpiritual life* be *much more* abated by many eruptions of their *natural luſts*, and injections of *Satans temptations*, and ſo be not potent enough to preſerve them from *ſinning with an high hand*, without the *ſpecial aſſiſtance of heaven*? There is in *every Saint* ſo much of the *old man*, as is apt to tell him, that *ſpiritual life* is not worth the holding upon ſuch *harſh terms*, as to abandon the dear *pleaſures* of ſinne, and renounce the *profits* and *accommodations* of it, and ſpend his whole *life* in a continual mortifying himſelfe. What ever you finde in *your ſelf*, the generality of the Saints will humbly acknowledge, that they have *a law in their members rebelling againſt the law of their mindes, and leading them ever and anon captive unto the law of ſin*; & that were their *ſpiritual life in their own hands*, they ſhould be apt every moment to offer an abhorred *violence* to it; they confeſſe, they have much more *corruption* then *grace*; more of *earth* then *heaven*, of *fleſh* then *Spirit* in them; that the *fleſh* lies cloſe under the beſt of their *graces*; and had not God decreed to preſerve them by his own *bleſſed influences*, it would ſecretly *eat them all out*; ſo that nothing can ſecure them from feare of Apoſtatizing, leſſe then a *decree of heaven* to preſerve them, which *our* doctrine holds forth as *neceſſary*, *yours* laughes at as *needleſſe*.

And it is bold to tell us, that, [though it ſhould be granted, that the Propenſion in the Saints to abſtain from ſin, ſimply be not ſo great, as that natural deſire in men, to preſerve their natural lives, yet that poſſibly it may be; yea, and probably is, every way as potent, and operative, in reference to *ſome* ſinnes, and particularly to thoſe, which are likely to occaſion, or produce finall Apoſtaſie.] §. 58.

I know no Saint beſide your ſelfe, that dares own this; what ſin is there, that any Saint can pretend to ſo ſtrong a propenſion to abſtain from it, when he remembers into what deſperatenes, *Noah*, *Lot*, *David*, *Jonah*, *Peter*; every one of thoſe who are moſt eminent in the Book of God, did unawares fall? Good Sir, give us leave to acknowledge, we owe it to Gods *keeping our feet*, that we *runnot to all exceſſe of wickedneſſe*; what were our [propenſions to abſtain from it,] were it not for *his gracious reſtraining us*? how would our *love* beſot us, our *anger* enrage us, our *hope* bribe us, our *feare* baffle us, *either* of them, and much more *all* inſenſibly betray us to the *greateſt abominations*? when God hath made us moſt happy *partakers of the divine nature*, wo is us that we have too much of the *old man*; yea, the *beaſt* in us. It is not all the portion of grace we have *received*, would ſerve to maintain us, were it put into our own *keeping*. It is onely our *heavenly Fathers* care, that preſerves *it* for *us*, and *us* by *it*. We are ſenſible, our very *improvement* would prove our *loſſe*; and that we ſhould grow *proud* of being *humble*, and by our *beſt Works* be inſnared in the *worſt*, did not he graciouſly watch over us; ſo that notwithſtanding all our [propenſion to abſtain] from the greateſt evill, nothing can ſecure us from the fear of a *finall Apoſtaſie*, but that which your doctrine ſo pleaſantly frumpes us with a [decree of heaven to preſerve us.]

And whereas you merrily adde, that [though there be in every ſin whatſoever, a natural tendency according to the kinde and degree of it towards Apoſtaſie, even that which is final, as there is in every light prick with a pin in a mans finger, towards the diſſolution of the natural life; yet as no man is diſturbed in his peace, and comfort touching the continuance of his health and life, by a drop or two of blood drawn from his finger, by the ſcratch of a pin; ſo neither is there any reaſonable ground, or

occaſion, why upon the commiſſion of every ſinne a Saint ſhould be ſtruck into a paſſion of feare of falling away, unleſſe he hath an aſſurance from heaven, that he ſhall not fall away.]

We deſire you to know, that *we* look on [*every ſinne*] as that which is *mortal*; and what *you* compare but to a [prick of a pin in the finger] *we* eſteem as a wound with a *ſpear* at the *heart*; and were it but as the [prick of a pin in the finger] we have known how ſome have *died of ſuch a prick*; which hath *gangrened*, and being at firſt neglected as *inconſiderable*, hath at laſt proved no leſſe then *incurable*; We know no [prick] ſo little, as that any but the *baſſom* of Chriſts blood can heale it: the *ſmalleſt ſin*, hath *too much malignity* in it; and is apt to *feſter* and *rankle* to our *deſtruction*: yea, our *ſcratching* would ſoon make every [prick] an *ulcer*, and every ulcer *immedicabile vulnus*, had we not an engagement of the *Great Phyſician* to heale it; ſo that nothing ſecures us from *fear of periſhing in the leaſt ſinne*, but onely an aſſurance from *heaven*. We do indeed allow your diſtinction of [ſins of infirmity or *quotidianæ incurſionis*, and ſins of preſumption and *vaſtantia conſcientiam*.] But withall we adde, that the leaſt [ſin of infirmity] would ſoon prove *ſtrong* enough to lay *waſte our conſciences*, did not the *hand of God* mercifully prevent; nor can we ſatisfie our ſelves againſt the danger of a finall Apoſtaſie, with leſſe then an aſſurance from heaven, *to preſerve us from every evill Work unto that* glorious *kingdome*: So farre are we from allowing our ſelves to ſuppoſe as you do, that in reſpect of *any*, the *greateſt* ſinnes [the inclination of the Saints may be as ſtrong and free towards a Non-Commiſſion of them, as the naturall inclination in men is towards a ſelfe-preſervation.] For I muſt take the boldneſſe to remember you, that men deſtroy not their *natural lives* without *pain*, and when they have *begun* to act towards it, the *pain* hath many times checked them from *proceeding*, but there is an *unregenerate* part in *every* Saint, which takes but too much *pleaſure* in ſins of all dimenſions; *yea*, ſuffers as much *pain* in the ſad continuance of *ſpiritual life*; the *beſt men* have too much in them, which *delights* in *wounding* them to *death*, and is no leſſe *tortured* in all the actions of *ſpiritual life*: there is that in the *beſt of the Saints*, which is apt to complain of a harſh *bitterneſſe* in the greateſt *pleaſures* of *Gods houſe*, and what ever gives moſt *refreſhing* to the *ſpirit*, is as *vexatious* to the *fleſh*, conſidering how much we carry about us, which *rejoyceth* in the *mortall wounds* we receive by ſin; you may well be ſatisfied, that we are not ſatisfied with any aſſurance leſſe then a *decree of heaven for our preſervation* from *finall Apoſtaſie*.

§. 31. Nor indeed can we give any credit at all to what you avouch next with a competent confidence, that [whether that inclination or diſpoſition in the Saints, which you now ſpeak of, be actually, and in the generality of them, according to their preſent conditions, commenſurable, in ſtrength, power, and every other deſirable property, with the inclination in men to preſerve their natural lives, by the forbearance of all acts whatſoever apparently deſtructive to them, or no; moſt certain it is, that God hath vouchſafed unto them, a ſufficiency of means in abundance, to make them every wayes commenſurable hereunto; yea, to raiſe them to an higher pitch or degree of ſtrength and power, then ſo; yea, and further, hath made the ſame every way capable, all their infirmities, and weakneſſes allowed, of the uſe of theſe means, even to the producing of ſuch a glorious and bleſſed effect as that.]

Reverend Sir, *we* ſhall be all as forward as *you* in magnifying the unmeaſurable riches of the goodneſſe of God to us, in vouchſafing us [a ſufficiency of means,] to preſerve us from ever deſtroying our ſoules; but we as humbly profeſſe, that this *ſufficiency* notwithſtanding, we are not *ſufficient of our ſelves*, even in the midſt of theſe *meanes*: there is we grant a *ſufficiencie* in the *meanes*, both to *keep Saints* from deſtroying their ſoules, and to *bring the worſt of ſinners* to ſave themſelves from the deſtroyer; that is, the *meanes (no genere*, are *ſufficient*, and need no *further addition* or *ſupplement*; but though there be ſo full a *ſufficiency* in the *means*, there muſt be acknowledged an *inſufficiency* in the *beſt Saints*, to make ſo happy *uſe* of them, as to have [their hearts raiſed] (as you phraſe it) [to a higher pitch or degree of ſtrength and power, then ſo;] that is, to forbear *ſinnes* which are deſtructive to their *ſoules*, then they have of forbearing acts of *violence* to their *bodies*,

bodies. There is no Saint, unleſſe of ſome new Canonization, that ever preſumed to pretend to *this.* I beſeech you conſider, men have nothing but what is from *without*, that puts them into ſuch an *unnatural rage*, as to lay *hands* on *themſelves*; there is *no man* doth *this*, but in a fit of *fury* or *griefe*; and even *theſe paſſions* are not without ſome *controllings* and *checkings*, both of *reaſon*, and natural *love* of life; but *all men* have that *within* them, which without any irritation from *abroad*, is too apt to put them on *ſinnes* deſtructive to their ſoules; yea, and which cannot be *held in* from ſuch pernicious courſes, by all *diſſwaſives* preſented unto them by ſuch objects, as their thoughts do ever and anon neceſſarily encounter. There is *fleſh* more or leſſe (I hope) in *every Saint*; and look how much *fleſh* there is, ſo much is there as *hates life*, and is *enamoured* on the *death* of the *ſoule*; the *wiſdome of the fleſh* φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς, the ſublimate, and moſt refined part of it, *neither is, nor can be ſubject to the Law of God*: and as long as *this* continues, and continue it will, as long as we ſojourne in theſe *Tabernacles of clay*, we may not expect to attain to ſuch [a degree of ſtrength to forbeare ſin] as may be bold to avouch it ſelf [commenſurable to our natural inclination, to preſerve our natural lives,] much leſſe as you are pleaſed to pretend to *exceed* it. In *every* man there is *one* part, which is at once both *wilde* and doting; while the *Saints* are in the *fleſh*, there will be *fleſh* in the *Saints*; and *luſts* that will never ceaſe to *warre againſt the ſoule*, and uſe all poſſible meanes to deſtroy it, and that too, as it were by a colour of *Law*, ſuch as is in the *members* of the *beſt man*; which makes me riſe much higher in my wonder at your next paſſage; [ſo that if the ſaid inclination in the Saints, be not every way as ſerviceable unto them, in ſecuring them againſt all fears of acting, in any way apparently deſtructive to their great ſpiritual intereſt the ſaving of their ſoules, as the other inclination in men is to them, to ſecure them from feares of doing any thing knowingly, to the unavoidable loſſe of their lives; the fault is meerly and abſolutely in themſelves, and this not through any infirmity or weakneſſe which is natural to them, and ſo inſeparable; but through a groſſe, ranke and ſtupid careleſſenes, and ſloth.]

Alas, this [groſſe, ranke, ſtupid careleſſenes, and ſloth,] is as natural to them, as infirmity, and weakneſſe; the *natural part* in them is alike *weak* and *corrupt*; and if they ſhould at any time ceaſe to *fear* it, this *ſecurity* would ſoon prove their *deſtruction*, nothing but *fear* can *ſecure* them from it; were it not that the Saints have an *aſſurance* from *heaven* that they ſhall be *preſerved*, they might well fear their *own hands*, though never ſo *manacled*, that *they* would be the unhappy *inſtruments* of their *deſtruction*. You at length gravely conclude [if thus, then is not the doctrine of falling away any wayes prejudicial to the peace and comfort of the Saints, in reſpect of it ſelfe, but meerly accidentally, and occaſionally, *viz.* as the Saints will voluntarily, and without any neceſſity, either from within, or from without, compelling them, break out into ſuch extravagancies of ſinne, which that doctrine being true, may juſtly fill them with feares of falling away, and periſhing.] Yes, it is a *direct concluſion* from *that doctrine* which denies the *ſupportance of heaven to* them, at leaſt *aſſured* by an *unchangeable decree*, for nothing but *this* can ſettle their hearts, amidſt all their *weakneſſes* and *corruptions*; that they ſhall not *voluntarily caſt themſelves upon ſuch acts*, as will prove their *inevitable ruine*. See now who carry it with moſt *comfort* to the Saints, and *honour* to God; *You* who will tell them to this purpoſe, that [the decree of God notwithſtanding they may periſh by a voluntary ſlothfulneſſe and ſecurity;] and yet withall, that [they have ſo much power, as that unleſſe they be groſſely, rankly, and ſtupidly careles, they cannot periſh;] or *we* who ſay, they are apt to be ſo [groſſely, rankly, and ſtupidly careles,] as that without the *eſpeciall aſſiſtance* of heaven, *deſigned* and *decreed irreverſibly, from all eternity*, they muſt *needs periſh*; but withall, that that [groſs, rank, and ſtupid careleſſeneſſe] whereunto they are ſtill too prone, notwithſtanding God hath from *everlaſting* paſſed an *immutable decree*, that they ſhall be *ſo graciouſly ſupported* as *never to periſh*. *You*, forſooth, will needs have the Saints *ſufficiently provided againſt for fear*, by the conſideration of what is *in themſelves*; but deny that God either *hath* or *can infallibly decree to preſerve them*: *we* affirm the Saints have *nothing* in *themſelves* but what is too *weak* to preſerve them; onely we aſſure them of

ſafety,

ſafety, by the *goodneſs of God*, whoſe *hand* is *irreſiſtible*, whoſe *will* is *irreverſible*. You do not conclude this Section till you have told us one thing more, which you ſay [may not be omitted, that even the aſſertors of the common doctrine of perſeverance, do affirm, and teach that their doctrine it ſelfe notwithſtanding, the Saints under ſuch extravagancies of ſin as we ſpeak of, can have no comfort, peace, or aſſurance of ſalvation, and conſequently no aſſurance of perſevering in faith unto the end. Therefore no ſuch great difference between your doctrine and theirs, in point of comfort;] I anſwer: Thus it pleaſeth God to clear *our doctrine* by the mouth of *its adverſary*. For if we teach thus, as you acknowledge, then how injuriouſly have you charged us, with [encouraging men to aſſure themſelves of ſalvation in the height of exorbitancy and extravagancy.] *This piece*, and *much of this Chapter*, wherein you load us with an inſufferable calumny, as if we opened heaven to all unclean, unmercifull, ungodly men, if *once* Saints, hang as well together, as *harp*, and *harrow*, and make as harmonious a conſort,

2. We do not [bid men aſſure themſelves of heaven,] but onely in a ſtate of *repentance*, and in *ſuch an eſtate* we ſafely *may*, and confidently *do*.

Laſtly, the difference between *us* and *you*, lies in this; *You* comfort men with hope they may either *ſtand* ſo, as *not to need to repent*, or *repent* ſo as to *riſe again* by ſomewhat in *themſelves*. *We* will them to look *higher*, both for their *ſtrength* and *comfort*, and to acknowledge they owe *both* to what can never fail, a *Decree of heaven*; we minde them while they are in an [extravagancy,] of the *diſhonour* they do to that gracious *God*, who put a happy difference between *them* and *others*; and at once tell them, they have nothing of *themſelves*, but what is juſt matter of *ſhame* and *grief* to them, and that if they *repent*, they muſt return *all the glory of it to God*, and then may as much *rejoyce in him*.

§. 32. As if you diſtruſted all you have ſaid hitherto, as if it were too ſhort, at leaſt not ſufficiently clear; you proceed to indoctrinate us what *thoſe meanes* are, which God hath given in ſuch abundance to the Saints, to preſerve them from the *danger*, and conſequently from the *fear* of Apoſtaſie, [equal to thoſe which men have for the preſervation of their natural lives.]

And, 1. You ſay [there is nothing indangers the ſalvation of the ſoule but ſin, yea, only ſuch ſins, as are notoriouſly manifeſt to the Saints, if not by the light of nature, yet by the Scriptures; ſo that God hath vouchſafed them ſufficient means to inform them, of what is apparently deſtructive to their ſoules.]

Right; and ſo he hath, and not only the [*Saints*,] but *all other men*: But though the Saints have means to *ſee ſuch ſinnes*, have they not withall too much in them, ever and anon to *blinde* them that they cannot *ſee* them? have they not *luſt* as well as *reaſon*? and doth not *luſt* ever and anon, bleare the eye of *reaſon*, ſo that they do not ſee things which are *near* enough at hand? yea, doth it not repreſent *ſin* as *none*, yea, as *good*? He that conſiders the *deceitfulneſſe of ſin*, its *Sophiſtry*, and *Rhetorick*, *its dexterity* in putting *fair* colours on *foule* practices, in *diſtinguiſhing* and *limiting*, *cutting*, *and mincing*, needs not doubt but that the greateſt proportion of *reaſon* that is in the Saints, may be many times outwitted by *luſt*. Yea, which is that *all Saints* have ever found by unhappy experience, that their very *reaſon* hath been imployed by *luſt*, to ſpend its beſt ſtrength in their behalfe againſt *God* and *its ſelfe*; and hence the Saints are afraid of nothing more then their *carnal reaſon*; as finding nothing more *difficult* then to *captivate their thoughts*, and bring *them into ſubjection to the obedience of Chriſt*; and nothing more *dangerous* then to attribute too much to their *reaſon* being *made by their luſts*, and ſo corrupted as to plead in the defence of their unworthy *encroachments* and *uſurpations*.

§. 33. 2. Say you [God hath given them eyes wherewith and light, whereby clearly and evidently to ſee and know that it is not more rational and manlike, to refrain ſuch actions, as endanger their bodies, then ſuch as are apparently deſtructive to their ſoules]

True; yea, it is evident it is *much more* [*rational* and manly,] for in *many* caſes, it is *rational* and *manly* to *hazard* the *deſtruction* of their *lives*; yea, not to *accept deli-*

verance

verance, but *per virtutem mori, quàm per dedecus vivere.* But it is *irrational* in the higheſt, to expoſe their *ſoules to* the leaſt *danger*; but what of this? do not their *eyes* many times ſerve to ſee, there is no way to *ſecure* themſelves but by *this danger?* and have not the beſt of Saints, thought it ſometimes to be *diſcretion* to do ſuch things as are apparently *deſtructive* to their ſoules? not onely to ſave their *lives*, but their *eſtates* or *names*, and not conſidered as they ought, that to *ſave* them upon ſuch termes, is a ſure way to *loſe* them, even while they *enjoy* them; the *curſe of God* making them empty enjoyments, and the *gripings* of their *ſoules* rendring them *worſe?* But laſtly, what I pray are theſe, [eyes] diſtinct from reaſon and grace, of which you ſpake before? ſo that this is but to ſay the *ſame* thing in *other* words.

3. God ſay you [hath not onely given them the eyes and light we ſpeak of, but hath further indued them with a faculty of conſideration, ſo as to reflect upon, and review; to weigh, and ponder as oft as they pleaſe, what they ſee and underſtand; and know in this kind.] This is ſtill but the uſe of their *reaſon*; how excellent are you at *variations?* but when all is done, hath not *luſt* a faculty to hinder theſe *conſiderations* by ſuggeſting other *thoughts?* Hath not *fear* a ſlight to *betray the ſuccours which reaſon offers? hath not every luſt* tricks of *diverſion?* and do not the luſts make, that *men* the beſt of them *inconſiderately* run on *ſin*, and *in any conſideration* how to *provide* for the ſafer *contrivance of it?* The generality of Saints finde much of this in themſelves to be too true, only it ſeems Mr. *Goodwin* hath attained to ſo *eminent a degree of perfection*, that he hath no *law in his members rebelling againſt the law of his minde, and leading him* at any time *captive to the law of ſin*, nor needs complain of *his body of death*; he doth ſo *ſerve the law of God in his minde*, that he never *ſerves in his fleſh the law of ſin.* He is never *worſted* by ſuch an *enemy* as *corruption*, nor *betrayed* by *falſhood* in his heart, and keeping himſelfe from ſuch ſinnes as would be [apparantly deſtructive to his ſoul,] he needs not fear *ſecret* ſins, but as proixly as he diſputes for the Apoſtaſie of *vulgar Saints* of a lower forme, he needs no more fear *his own* falling in this kinde, then his falling on his *own ſword.* §. 34.

And next he addes, that [the wickedneſſe of the Saints, and their aptneſſe to ſin, are indeed ſufficient to cauſe them to fear, but not the fear of falling away from God, or from his grace, but that fear which the Scripture is wont to oppoſe to high-mindedneſſe.] Let all the Saints judge, who makes men moſt *high-minded*; *We*, who ſay the Saints are *of themſelves* ever and anon *apt to fall away* from God through their *own corruptions and infirmities*, and in this reſpect duly preſſe them to a holy *jealouſie*, and *fear* of *themſelves*, onely we *ſecure* them in this *fear* by a *decree of heaven*, adding, that *nothing* but ſuch *a decree* can ſecure them; or Mr. *Goodwin*, who ſaith expreſſely, that [certain it is, that the weakneſſes and infirmities of the Saints, through which they are apt to ſin; do not require any ſuch Decree in God, which includes in it an impoſſibility of their falling away, to render them ſecure from or againſt ſuch falling,] you will ſay hereafter that [no ſuch decree can be allowed to be mentioned in Scripture without detracting from the authority of thoſe ſacred books;] and who hath ſaid already [that God may intend things which never come to paſſe;] ſo that we make the Saints *ſecurity* from Apoſtaſie to depend on a *Decree of heaven.* Mr. *Goodwin denies ſuch a decree*, and yet *aſſures the Saints* in the midſt of his diſcourſe for Apoſtaſie, that [they need as little fear ſuch falling away, as an unnatural diſpatching themſelves with their own hands.] §. 35.

CHAP. II.

In anſwer to the tenth Chapter of Mr. Goodwins *Book, the ſecond of his Digreſſion.*

§. 1. THe firſt Section is ſuch as hath nothing but words in it, and concernes only your intended Method, which is; [Firſt to diſarme your Adverſaries of the weapons wherein they truſt, and then to eſtabliſh your own Aſſertion,] doubtleſs with irrefragable Arguments.

§. 2. 2. You tell us [that moſt of the places compelled to ſerve in this warfare, are found ſituate in the New Teſtament.] (And what of that?) [The firſt that cometh to hand, is that of our Saviour unto *Peter*: *And upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not prevaile againſt it.* From hence, ſay you, it is argued; [*That thoſe that are once built by faith upon the Rock Chriſt, or upon the truth of the Goſpel, are not in danger, or in a poſſibility of being prevailed againſt,* viz. *to deſtruction, by all the powers of darkneſſe whatſoever.*] And it is rightly inferred; for, if *one* of thoſe that are ſo built, may be ſo *prevailed againſt*, then may *all*; *all* being in this reſpect *alike*, as having *alike liberty of will* I trow, which renders any *one* of them, as well as *another* liable to deſtruction; and *all* being preſerved by the *ſame power of God*, which is as ſufficient to keep *every one*, as *any* of them; and *all* having *alike* intereſt in the *love*, and *faithfulneſſe* of God, which engages his *power* for *every* one of them, as well as *other*, to preſerve them from *falling away*, though not from *falling*. So then, *Whoever is built by faith*, that is, not in *profeſſion* only, but *reality*, hath *this aſſurance* from Chriſt; *That the gates of hell ſhall not prevaile againſt him.* If the *gates of hell* may *prevaile* againſt *one*, ſo may they againſt *another*, and ſo againſt *all*; and then what I pray becomes of the *Church*, when the *Members* are *all* loſt?

§. 3. To this Argument you anſwer,

[1. That this promiſſory aſſertion of Chriſt, doth not neceſſarily reſpect every individual perſon, who *de præſenti* is a Member of his Church, ſo as to ſecure him of his ſalvation againſt all poſſible ſins, or wayes of ſinning, whereinto he may be drawn by Satan, but may well be underſtood of the Church in *general*, *i. e.* conſidered as a body of men, ſeparate, and diſtinguiſhed from the World. Now the Church may be ſaid to ſtand, notwithſtanding not only ſome, but all the particular Saints, of which this body conſiſts at preſent, ſhould be prevailed againſt by Satan to deſtruction; becauſe the *ratio formalis* of the Church, doth not conſiſt in the perſons, who do at preſent believe; but in the ſucceſſive generation of thoſe, who in their reſpective times believe.]

I Reply, that it is true, this promiſe concernes the Church in *general*; but upon *your grounds*, the Church in *general*, cannot be ſecured from deſtruction, unleſſe *every particular Member* of it be ſo alſo: For, if *any particular Member* may be deſtroyed, then may *another*, and ſo *another*, and ſo *all*; and where then is the *body*, when *all the Members* are cut off? The Church in *general* may be without *this* or

that

that Member; But if *all* the Members be deſtroyed, the Church I hope cannot be ſaid to be ſaved; when *no* individuals are in being, the Church in *general* is not in being. What you ſay of the [River of *Thames*, that though there be not one drop of the water in it now, that was in it ſeven years ſince; yet it is the ſame River which it was then,] is but a dry *ſimile*; I wis if there were *never a drop of water in it now*, it were *no River*; and ſo if the Church ſhould loſe *every Member*, it ſhould be *no longer a Church*; albeit it be the ſame Church *now*, which it was five hundred years ago, though *not one* of thoſe Members of the Church *which were then*, be *now* on the earth: But thoſe Members which were *then* on *earth*, are *now* in *heaven*; as thoſe *drops* which were *ſeven years ſince* in the *Thames*, are now in the Ocean. So for your ſecond inſtance; [though now there be not one perſon alive, in any Company of *London*, which was one hundred years ſince; yet is it true, the Companies are the ſame ſtill: But if there were *no Member of the Company now in being*, the *Company were diſſolved*: And ſo if no Member of the Church were *now in being*, the *Church were deſtroyed*. But ſay I, If *one* Member may periſh, then may *another*, and ſo *all*; and if *all in this generation*, then as well *all in the next*, and ſo onward to the end of the World. So that unleſſe *every one* be ſecured from deſtruction, *no one* Beleever is, *all* the ſtrongeſt being *alike* apt to be betrayed by that which is in *themſelves*; the power of God being no more *able*, and being no more *engaged* to preſerve any *one*, then *every one* of them, all are alike.

2. You anſwer, [When our Saviour promiſeth that the *Gates of hell ſhall not prevaile againſt his Church*, his meaning queſtionleſſe is this; that Death, or the Grave, (which may very properly be called the Gates of Hell; becauſe they that go to Hell, enter by them thereinto,) or elſe that Hell it ſelf ſhall not prevaile; that is, ſhall not have a full, or finall conqueſt over thoſe that ſhall die, built upon the Rock, he ſpeaks of, by faith, as by reaſon of their moſt formidable ſtrength, they are like to have over all other men.] §. 4.

I Reply, 1. That *Death* or the *Grave* may upon *your ground*, be as well ſtiled the *gates of Heaven*; becauſe they that *go to Heaven*, enter *by them thereinto*. 2. When you ſay, [Hell ſelf ſhall not prevaile, &c.] do you mean by *Hell*, the *place and torments* of Hell, or elſe the *power* and *policy* of the devils in Hell? If the *firſt*, then, 1. Have they *no conqueſt at all* over *any* that [die in belief;] for *none* of *them* ever come to that *place*, or ſuffer thoſe *torments*. 2. They are not only [like to have,] but ſurely *ſhall have* a [full and finall conqueſt] over all *others*. Your word [like to have,] implies you hold, that *ſome dying in unbelief*, may eſcape a [full conqueſt of Hell over them;] or elſe perhaps, that *all of them may at length poſſibly*, though it be not [like.] be freed from that *place and torments*.

Say you, [according to this interpretation, the meaning only is, that thoſe that ſhall continue formally built on him by faith, ſhall in time be delivered out of the hand of all adverſe powers, yea from Death, and the Grave themſelves, the moſt formidable of all others.] True, nor do we ſay more; but are not the *temptations* of the Devil [adverſary powers?] they that believe ſhall be *freed from them*, ſay *we*; and were they not *freed from them*, they could not well be *reſcued from the power of the grave*; yea, thoſe who are not *reſcued from the power of Satans temptations*, ſhall finde themſelves never *more miſerable*, then when they ſhall be arter their faſhion *freed from the power of the grave*. Their *Reſurrection* is *that* which of all other things, they have moſt cauſe to dread; and they will wiſh themſelves *buried under the rocks and mountaines*, that they might *never riſe* to eternall confuſion.

Chryſoſtomes interpretation of Hell by the Grave we *grant* true, but *deny* it to be *full*. §. 5.

Of *Camerons* we ſay the ſame; but adde, that *Cameron* doth not *deny our interpretation*; And whereas you ſay, [He brings arguments againſt every other interpretation of the place, but their's, who conſtrue Hell by the Grave;] you have *better eyes* then other men, that can ſee ſuch arguments of *Cameron*, which I am confident no other man can diſcerne. But you have *worſe eyes* then ordinary, in not ſeeing the concluſion which *Cameron* makes of his diſcourſe upon this Text in theſe words: §. 6.

Quid igitur? non meminit Chriſtus hîc tentationum atque inſultuum Satanæ? Sanè, ſed conſequenter. Nam cùm de mortis & ſepulchri in Dei populum irrito conatu hîc agatur, omnino ſequitur ut hic locus etiam ad tentationes pertineat, quas niſi cœlitus Chriſti ope detur exire, mortem & ſepulchrum dominari neceſſe eſt.

You next quote [*Muſculus* referring it to the Rock, not to the Church; and ſo underſtanding it of the Doctrine of faith, not the perſons of Beleevers;] but the words which you quote out of *Muſculus*, *Non quòd dubitem de Eccleſiæ ſoliditate, ſed quòd ea ſit ex petrâ*, are ſuch as we acknowledge, with all readineſſe; nor do we aſcribe the *ſafety of the Church*, in *whole*, or *part* to *any thing*, but the *firmneſſe of the Rock* on which it is built; Whether by Rock be meant the *Perſon of Chriſt*, or the *Doctrine of Chriſt*? And ſurely this is one principal branch of it, which you mention here, little to your advantage; This is *the Fathers Will, that of thoſe that he hath given me, I ſhould* Joh. 6. 39. *loſe nothing, but ſhould raiſe it up again at the laſt day*. This relates not to the [*Doctrine*,] but to the [*perſons of Believers*,] and ſayes expreſſely, that not *one of them* ſhall be *loſt*; but ſhall be *raiſed again*, that is, to *everlaſting happineſſe*; and therefore ſhall be preſerved from *falling from faith*, which elſe would of courſe be a *falling into deſtruction*. So that if this Text do [ſemble] as you ſay [this, *the gates of hell ſhall not prevaile againſt it*,] then is the *perſeverance of Beleevers* affirmed in *this Scripture*, as it is in *that*.

§. 7. That you ſay [which is pleaded by ſome for ſuch a ſenſe of the place, which carries the Doctrine of perſeverance in it, is weak and valueleſſe, whatſoever (ſay theſe) oppoſeth the building of the Church upon the Rock, or the conſtant adhering of it to Chriſt, is meant by the *Gates of Hell prevailing*. For in theſe words, *and the gates of hell ſhall not prevaile againſt it*, Chriſt muſt needs be ſuppoſed to remove whatſoever is contrary to that which he had aſſerted in theſe, *And upon this Rock will I build my Church*: But the politick, and ſubtile tentations of Satan, to ſeduce Beleevers, are oppoſite to the building of the Church upon the Rock, and to the conſtant adhering of it unto Chriſt: Therefore by the *Gates of hell not prevailing againſt the Church*, muſt needs be meant the defeature or non-prevailing of the ſtratagems, or counſels of Satan againſt Beleevers, and conſequently their perſevering unto the end. To this you anſwer,

Firſt, denying the *major*; for [that which Chriſt] (ſay you) takes away in this clauſe, *And the gates of hell ſhall not prevaile againſt it*, is not whatſoever oppoſeth the building of his Church upon the Rock; but whatſoever oppoſeth the happineſſe of it being ſo built, and adhering conſtantly, and perſeveringly unto him; for αυτῆς, *it* doth not relate to the verb οἰκοδομήσω, *I will build*, but to the ſubſtantive ἐκκλησίαν, *the Church*.]

I anſwer, that it is true, αυτῆς referres to ἐκκλησίαν, not οἰκοδομήσω; but χρισθὲν refetres to οἰκοδομήσω, as well as ἐκκλησίαν, and the oppoſition ſtands thus, that whereas the Church might ſeem to be heretofore, rather *pitcht* ſomewhat ſlightly in the earth, as a *Tent* or *Tabernacle*; it ſhall be henceforth *built* as a *houſe*, and firmrly as an *houſe upon a Rock*; Which though the *windes blow*, and *waves beat againſt it*, ſhall for *ever ſhand unremovable*, and as it were *unſhaken*. So that theſe words, *and the gates of hell ſhall not prevaile againſt it*, do not only repreſent the [*happineſs of the Church being built*, and *adhering to Chriſt*,] as you ſpeak; but the happineſſe of the Church *in being ſo built* as to *adhere unto Chriſt for ever*. And when you adde,

Secondly, [Whereas in the ſaid propoſition, Chriſts *building of his Church* is expounded by the *conſtant adhering of this Church unto him*, that which is the *principal thing in queſtion*, is taken for *granted*, which is very inargumentative; for the matter in queſtion is, whether the Church or Members of it, once built upon the Rock, muſt, or do neceſſarily ſo adhere *unto him*?]

I anſwer, that the *building* is not expounded by *adhering of the Church unto Chriſt*, as if the *Churches adhering unto Chriſt* were its *building*. I wis *it is after it*; but the Churches *building* is expounded by a building *like that of a houſe on a Rock*, which inferres a *conſtant adhering to Chriſt*, which is not ſo inartificial, as you pretend. We

do

do not make the Churches *being built upon a Rock*, and *adhering to Christ*, to be the *same*; but say, *this building* is *such*, as whence we may safely *conclude* the Churches *adhering to Christ*; and consequently the *perseverance of every Believer*; *every one* being as a *living stone* in *this building*; and whereas you conclude after your wont,

Thirdly, [The said exposition renders a sense very prepostorous and importune: for upon this account, Christ should speak at no better rate then thus: *The gates of hell shall not prevaile*, i.e. *the subtilty, policy, and machinations of Satan, shall not be able to seduce those that are built upon the Rock; that is, that constantly adhere unto Christ*, which amounts to no more then this: the Devil shall not be able to make those inconstant, who shall be and remain constant; or to cause those who shall firmly adhere to Christ, not to adhere firmly to him,]

You are too forward; if to be *built*, and to *adhere to Christ*, were *formally* the same, I confesse your glosse were right. But the *building* being *first in nature*, and the *adhering after* it, it is not so, but this is very good sense: the Church shall be *so firmly built upon Christ*, that it shall stand *in spite of all powers that shall oppose*; it is *so firmly built* upon this foundation, that the Devil shall not be able either to *blow it up*, or *beat it down*; but *such as believe in Christ*, shall continue constant, notwithstanding all that hell can do, to make them *inconstant*; so that this is a strain of discourse sufficiently becoming. You proceed to

Another Argument [urged by some against the interpretation given, and it is this: *If by the prevailing of the gates of Hell, be meant nothing else but the eternall condemnation of, or perpetual prevailing of Death against the Church, then Christ here promiseth nothing but in the behalf of those that are dead, and consequently nothing but what may stand with a total Apostasie of his Church on earth:* But this seemes to be contrary to his intention in the place: *Ergo.* §. 8.

You answer, 1. It is no inconvenience to affirme, Christ here doth not ensure the perpetual continuance of a Church on earth,] but you do but say it; for what [though *whosoever believes shall be saved, doth not carry such an assurance*, as that any one shall believe?] this of *building a Church* doth; this of building the Church in this manner, that the Church *shall be built*, and preserved, and so concernes the state of the Church only on earth; *where only* it is *built*, and *where only* it is *assaulted*; and consequently where *only* the gates of Hell do *not prevaile against it in these assaults.*

2. You say, [that though it do not concerne the Church on earth, yet there is enough in it, to fill the earth with a generation of Beleevers, like unto the waters of a River which faile not.]

I answer, unlesse Christ promise to build the Church, and preserve it on earth, from generation to generation; nothing is able to [fill the earth with such a generation of Beleevers;] and when you say, [this promise hath enough in it to do it, if men would but consider, and quit themselves like men:] Good Sir, they must become *children* ere they *believe*; nor are they any *other then stones*, though *living stones*, when they are put into *this building.*

3. You say, [That it is not true, that in that sense this promise *The Gates of Hell shall not*, &c. relates only to those that are dead;] but sure if it be *meant only of death*, it relates only to the *dead*; that is, not to be performed to any men till they be *dead*; and such promises, I yield, have just matter of comfort; but then this is no more then the *raising of the Saints out of their graves*, when as clearly Christ speaks of *building them*, not *re-edifying* them; of *building them in faith*, preserving them by his power, and making all the attempts of hell in vain, and unsuccessefull: this is apparent by what followes, *I will give thee the Keyes of Heaven*; I hope that is meant of *Keyes to be used on Earth*, and the binding and loosing are both *on Earth*; and consequently this is meant of a *Church on Earth*, and so the structure of your exposition is all in the dust. But say, the gates of Hell signifie, as *Cameron* carries it, (though you do not mention it) the power, and policy, wherewith *Hell* is wont to defend it self, and Kingdome in the hearts of men, against the Ministery of the Gospel in the Church; as indeed

gates, are for *defence* not *offence*; yet even in *this ſenſe*, 1. This Text includes a promiſe to be performed on *earth* contrary to what you deliver, And 2. Doth imply that the *power of hell* ſhall not be able to hinder the *converſion* of ſuch as God intends to ſave; and if not their *converſion*, ſurely much leſſe their *confirmation* and *perſeverance* in beleeving, *quod erat demonſtrandum*.

§. 9. You endeavour to [free, *Matth.* 24. 24. from the croſſe of our ſervice] as you
Matth. 24. 24. call it; but in the mean time, put this Text upon a miſerable *rack*, and untowardly diſlocate every *joynt* of it; as ſhall appear in the proceſſe of our diſcourſe.

The words are theſe: *For there ſhall ariſe falſe Chriſts, and falſe Prophets, and ſhall ſhew great ſignes and wonders; inſomuch that if it were poſſible, they ſhall deceive the very Elect.* From hence we inferre, that the deceiving of the *Elect* is impoſſible, and that as we humbly conceive very rationally: For were it *poſſible*, they ſhould be *deceived by theſe falſe Chriſts, and falſe Prophets*; we mean ſo as totally, and finally to fall off from the faith. But ſay you, [This is to fetch darkneſſe out of light, and water out of a flint,] witneſſe your following exceptions.

1. [That the Elect before their calling, are generally deceived.] True, but ſure they cannot be deceived, ſo as to be ſeduced *from the faith, before they received it*, ſo as to *renounce the faith before they embraced it*, no more then he can be ſaid to *fall off from your party that never ſtood among them*. Let [the Elect before their calling, be deceived:] as much as you liſt, they are not capable of being *deceived to Apoſtaſie, ere* they had a place among *Beleevers*; and *ſuch* is the *deceiving* we have now under conſideration.

2. [That according to our confeſſion, the Elect, even after they are called, may fall into Hereſie.] True, but can you inferre, *Ergo* into a *totall* and *finall* Apoſtaſie?

§. 10. Yes, ſay you, [into a total, and therefore a finall Apoſtaſie; for elſe one of theſe three things muſt follow, either, 1. That true ſaving and juſtifying faith may ſtand not only with Hereſie, and that in fundamental Articles of Chriſtian Religion; but even with an expreſſe abnegation, and abjuration of Chriſt himſelf, with his Religion]

I anſwer, 1. That as ſtrange, as it may ſeem it is not falſe that, juſtifying faith may ſtand with ſuch. For, 1. The Apoſtles *generally conceived* that Chriſts Kingdome was to be of this world, which I think is worthy the name of Hereſie. And, 2. Suſpected that Chriſt *he that ſhould have redeemed Iſrael*; which I humbly conceive may merit the ſame title. And 2. *Peter* more *particularly* was guilty, (as I have heard,) both of an [abnegation and abjuration of Chriſt himſelf,] and then of courſe of [his Religion;] and yet had Chriſt promiſed to *pray that his faith ſhould not faile*, and I trow *his faith* accordingly *did not faile*; and ſo [true ſaving and juſtifying faith,] (ſuch I ſuppoſe *Peters* was,) may be affirmed to ſtand; not only [with Hereſie, and that in fundamentall articles of Chriſtian Religion; but even with an expreſſe abnegation, and abjuration of Chriſt himſelf, with his Religion.]

2. I diſtinguiſh between Hereſie *materially*, and Hereſie *formally* conſidered. And ſay that in *this caſe*, albeit *Peter* and the other *Apoſtles*, were guilty of Hereſie in the *firſt ſenſe*, yet they were not guilty of it in the *ſecond*. There being required to *this* a *wilful*, and *pertinacious defending* of that which is *material* Hereſie. Every man that holds an opinion, *which is Hereſie*, is not preſently an *Heretick*. *Ignorance*, or *inconſiderateneſſe* may betray the beſt man, to an *opinion* which is *Hereſie*; that *opinion* is not enough to denominate him an *Heretick*, unleſſe there be an *acceſſion* of *obſtinacy* and *perverſneſſe* in the *defence* of it; which is alwayes the daughter of *pride* and *arrogancy*.

3. And accordingly I diſtinguiſh, of [abnegation. and abjuration of Chriſt and his Religion,] that it may be either ſuch as proceeds from a tumultuary *fear of miſchief* impendent, and threatening a man by others malice, or ſuch as raiſeth from a *deſpiſing of Chriſt* and *his Religion* for falſeneſſe apprehended in it in a mans *own thoughts*. The *firſt*, as in the caſe above, may be allowed to conſiſt with a *true juſtifying* and *ſaving faith*, though the *latter* cannot. Alas, Sir, in the *firſt* caſe, a man is meerly in a *ſwoun*

of

of *reaſon*, and doth not gather his thoughts together; In the *latter* his thoughts are *preſſed* to fight againſt Chriſt, and his Religion. In the *firſt* caſe he is but a *Coward*, and doth not *defend* the cauſe of Chriſt; In the *ſecond* he is as it were a *Champion* for the Devil to *fight* againſt Chriſt. In the *firſt* caſe he is *overcome* by the weakneſſe of his *fleſh*; In the *ſecond* he *triumphs* in the haughtineſſe of his *Spirit*.

But ſay you, [If ſaving faith may ſtand with ſuch Hereſie, and abnegation of Chriſt, how will that of Chriſt himſelf ſtand: *He that denieth me before men, him will I alſo deny before my Father, which is in heaven?*]

Yes, ſay I, that ſpeech of Chriſt is to be underſtood of a *final denial*, and of *that only*; elſe what I beſeech you had become of *Peter?* Had he not been ſhut out of Heaven, and kept out of the *Gates*, with his *Keyes at his girdle*?

Nor is there by your leave, [the ſame conſideration of a final denial of Chriſt, or in the end of a mans dayes, and that in the middle of them.] the [ſin] I yield you, [is the ſame] in reſpect of its *own nature*, it is not ſo in reſpect of the miſchief it draws on the ſinner; for that in the *end of a mans days* it is *irrecoverable*, it is not ſo in the *middle* of them. Should God deal in *judgement*, he might juſtly condemne a man, not only for *denying* Chriſt in the *middle of his dayes*, but for his *ſeed of hatred againſt God*, which was in him in the *firſt moment* of his life; And for *every failing* in *every action*, and there is a failing in *every action* to the *end* of his dayes. But I hope God hath made a more gracious Covenant, and engaged himſelf to grant pardon to every penitent man, caſting himſelf on Gods mercy in Chriſt; And, ſay we, God hath engaged himſelf to give repentance to the Elect, as well for *denying* of Chriſt out of *weakneſſe*, as for *other ſins*; and to keep or bring off all of them from *every evil work unto his heavenly Kingdome*. So that in this caſe though the *merit* of the ſin of *denying* Chriſt, in the *middle* and *end* of a mans dayes, be *alike*; yet the *iſſue* is not. Yea, the *merit of Chriſt* prevailes above the *merit of the ſin*, for his Elect; whom though he may ſuffer to *fall* in the *middle* of their dayes, he is ſure to *raiſe* before the *end* of them.

To evince the nullity of the aforeſaid Deduction from the place in hand, You ſay, [That this phraſe *εἰ δυνατὸν, if it be poſſible* doth not alwayes, if at any time, import the impoſſibilitie of a thing; but only the difficulty of a thing on the one hand, and the exquiſite diligence, and endeavours of thoſe, on the other hand, in reſpect of ſuch difficultie, who attempt it.] That [it doth not alwayes ſignifie an impoſſibility,] I am well content to yield you, and to acknowledge, 1 [That no impoſſibility is carried in that paſſage, *Acts* 20.16. *If it were poſſible for him to be at Jeruſalem the day of Pentecoſt.*] 2. That in [that Text, *Rom.* 12.18. *If it be poſſible, as much as in you lies, live peaceably with all men.*] I muſt take leave to tell you, that if *it be poſſible*, carries no leſſe then, 1. An *impoſſibility of all mens* living peaceably *with us*; And, 2. A *difficulty* of our being able to over-rule our ſelves, ſo as to live peaceably with *all men*; and thus the ſenſe under correction lies thus, Do your part to avoid all *ſtrife*, ſo as not to irritate the ſpirit of *any* man; albeit when you have done *all you can*, you cannot put your ſelf into *ſuch a poſture*, as whereat *no man* ſhall cavil. The *endeavour* on *your part* will be *comfortable*, although the *ſucceſſe* on *others* part be not ſuitable to the endeavours on *yours*. And what is there in this ſound that ſhould offend you? This [Trumpet] yields a ſound harmonious enough. §. 11.

The next Text which you only point at ſpeaks clear, *Matth.* 26. 39. *If it be poſſible, let this cup paſſe from me. Simply* it was *poſſible*, that that *cup* might have *paſſed from him*; Yea, we may all wonder, it ſhould be *put upon him* to drink it: but the *Decree* of God conſidered, it was *impoſſible*. And juſt ſo is the final falling of the Elect, too *poſſible* (God wot,) in reſpect of the *Elects infirmities*, and *corruptions*, and the *Devils malice*, and *power*, and *policy*; but *impoſſible* in reſpect of Gods *Decree* to preſerve his Elect. And for your laſt *Text*, *Galat.* 4.15. *I bear you witneſſe, that if it had been poſſible, you would have plucke out your own eyes, and have given them to me*; There was indeed no *ſimple impoſſibility* that they ſhould have *plucke out their eyes*,

eyes, and *given them to Paul*, ſo farre as to put them into his *hand*; but to put them into his *head*, ſo as he ſhould have been the *better* for them, was (I conceive under correction of better judgements) an utter *impoſſibility*. And unleſſe he might have been the *better* for the *Galatians* eyes; the *Galatians* had no great *reaſon* to be ſo forward as to *give them to him*, it being *impoſſible* it ſhould have been to any *purpoſe*.

§. 12. Having diſcharged theſe words ὡ δυνατὸν, from being burthened with the ſignification of an utter *impoſſibility* in the former Scriptures; You come now to proveit ſignifies not *ſo much* in this before us; but [that it imports only a difficulty, as hath been ſaid, of deceiving the Elect, *i. e.* Beleevers, together with the moſt raiſed, and vehement intentions in the falſe Prophets to effect it notwithſtanding; appeares yet more plainly from the Evangeliſt *Marke*, who records the ſame paſſage thus: *For falſe Chriſts, and falſe Prophets ſhall ariſe, and ſhall ſhew ſignes and wonders,* πρὸς τὸ ἀπο-πλανᾶν, *to ſeduce, if it were poſſible, the very Elect*; that is, with an *intent* and *ſtrong deſire* to draw off Beleevers themſelves from adhering unto the true Chriſt, &c. and to follow and embrace them in his ſtead.]

I anſwer, This Text doth not only ſignifie [the intent and endeavours of the falſe teachers, [but the *fruſtrating* of their [intent and endeavours] by the goodneſſe of God. For, 1. Chriſt had ſaid immediately *before*, that *for the Elects ſake thoſe dayes ſhall be ſhortened*; there is one particular wherein Gods goodneſſe to them appeares. Then, 2. *Here* he ſayes, their endeavours during the dayes, ſhall be fruſtrated. And, 3. In the Verſe *following* he ſeemes to reflect, by way of repetition, on what he had ſaid *before*; *Behold, I have told you before*; which word *before*, ſeemes to relate not only to the *deceits*: *I have told you of theſe deceits*; but to the *defeating* of their deceitful deſignes mentioned before, in this, that *for the Elects ſake thoſe dayes ſhall be ſhortened*. And, 4. *Luke* repeating this paſſage of our Saviours, though he omit *theſe* words, *If it be poſſible*, yet hath others equivalent: *There ſhall not a haire of your head periſh*; which though it reach to the ſaving of their *bodies*, that they ſhall not miſcarry; yet more eſpecially *eyes* that of their *ſoules*, *In your patience poſſeſſe your ſoules*. They could not well *poſſeſſe them in patience*, if in *ſuch danger of loſing them*. True, they were in *danger of loſing them*, in reſpect of their *own weakneſſe*, and theſe *deceivers wilineſſe*; but abundantly *ſecured* againſt that danger, by Gods *providence*, graciouſly watching over them, and guarding them.

2. This Text doth not ſpeak ſo much of [the falſe Chriſts deſigne, and diligence in proſecuting it,] as of Gods gracious purpoſe to *defeat* them, and the Elects *ſafety* in *that reſpect*.

For howbeit you are pleaſed to ſay, [Yea, it is no wayes likely, but that they had a farre greater deſire to practiſe their ſeducing Arts upon theſe, then any other ſort of men; becauſe they had ſet up, and upheld ſuch a Competitor with them in the world, who was like to carrie away the world from them, unleſſe they could prevaile with his followers, to diſown and diſclaime him.] I muſt tell you, 1. That this is not adviſedly enough ſaid, that the *Elect* or *Believers*, [had ſet up, and upheld ſuch a Competitor with the falſe Chriſts;] they are but *falſe Chriſtians* who preſume to ſay, they either [ſet up,] or [hold up] the *true Chriſt*. 2. That Chriſt is not [like to carry away the *World*] from the *falſe Chriſts*; the contrary is too apparent, Chriſts Doctrine and Ordinances, not being framed to the mode of the *world*. But, 3. Why ſhould you affirme, [the falſe Chriſts had a greater deſire to practiſe their ſeducing Arts upon theſe, then any other ſort of men?] 1. No [other ſort of men,] but *Beleevers*, could well be ſaid to be *ſeduced*; to be ſeduced, is to be led away from Chriſt. Now none can properly be ſaid to be *ſeduced*, or *led away from him*; but ſuch as did *profeſſe* at leaſt to *adhere to him* by believing. They who did really believe on him, as you confeſſe in your following words, [were as difficultly taken off, as letters are written in a ſwift ſtream, or men flie in the aire.] And I am bold to conceive either of theſe an *impoſſibility*, notwithſtanding all that is ſaid of *Dadalus*.

Pictori-

Pictoribus, atque Poetis,
Quidlibet audendi.

So that it was not for nought, that [*Galen* made] (as you say) [a kinde of Proverb, *A man may sooner unteach Christianity*;] but, 3. As for them among *Believers* who were *Elect*; which is the word in the Text, (the *Elect whom he hath chosen*, saith *Mark*, for the greater emphasis.) 1. I believe the false Christs did not acknowledge any were *so elect*. And, 2. I am sure, they could not know *who these elect were*, and therefore could have [*no such especial designe upon them*;] and consequently *such a designe* of theirs is not here spoken of, so signally as you are wont to phrase it. But Christs aime is to shew, that *such Elect*, though *not known* to these false Christs; are so *known*, that is so taken notice of, so provided for *by God*, that howbeit *others* that go for *Believers* be drawn aside, and *these* be in respect of *themselves* too apt to be seduced too; yet they shall be for *ever secured*, by the good *hand* of *God* upon them, notwithstanding all the plots, and projects of these deceivers, who leave nothing omitted that they can possibly act; and were it not that *God did prevent it*, it were *impossible* but they should *prevaile*; only *his providence* renders the Elects finall Apostasie *impossible*, when the deceivers have done *all* that they *possibly* can in order unto it.

Nay, but you adde, that [sometimes the difficulty notwithstanding, the Elect were seduced, appeares by that passage in *Tertullian*, *Siquidem edicens multos venturos, signa facturos, & virtutes magnas edituros, aversionem etiam Electorum, &c.*] L. 3. adv. Marc. C. 3

To this I answer, 1. That according to you, either *all* are Elect, or else *none at all*. 1. *All upon condition*, and *so whosoever* were *seduced*, were *Elect*, and then this of *aversionem etiam electorum* is too flat a speech for *Tertullian*. 2. None at all, *otherwise* then upon condition, and then *Elect* signifie no more then *others*. Or, 3. At best men are particularly elected, according to the *genius* of your and your confederates Doctrine, onely at their *death*, and *then* there is *no place* for this *deceiving*.

2. That (as for *Tertullian*,) 1. *His* testimony is not valuable against the *Evangelists*; if he say it was foretold by Christ, *that the false Christs should seduce the Elect*; and Christ say only as the Evangelists report him, that *the false Christs shall deceive the Elect, if it be, or were possible*; who I pray deserves better credit, *Matthew*, or *Tertullian*? yea, *Matthew* seconded by *Marke*, or *Tertullian* standing single?

2. What if *Tertullian* be misreported to us by false Copies? a little particle, *ad*, being *added*, (as perhaps it ought,) *diminisheth* all the strength of this Testimony; and shewes what was the *calculation* of their wonders, not what was the *product* of them; what they were apt to do, not what they did do.

3. What if *Tertullian*'s words, as reported, may be otherwise rendered? *aversio* doth not presently signifie a *finall Apostasie*; and if this were *aversio Electorum*, how I pray did they appear to be *Elect*, but by their *returne*?

And, 4. How can their *aversio*, whether for a *time*, or for ever be numbred amongst the *signa* here spoken, as it is by *Tertullian*, and jumbled up with *virtutes*? These words need a glosse; though I confesse neither *Beatus Rhenanus*, nor *Pamelius* have taken notice of them in their Comments. But lastly, how can you inferre from these words, *Edicens multos venturos, signa facturos, & virtutes magnas edituros, aversionem etiam Electorum*, that [sometimes it *was* done?] *Edituros* is, I take it, a participle of the *future tense*; and what if it be yet *to be done*? *Non constat*, [that it was done,] out of any *words* of *Tertullian*, nor that ever *it shall be done*, by any Argument of *yours*; though *your arguments*, I confesse, may do *too much*, *ad aversionem Electorum*.

If (say you) the phrase εἰ δυνατὸν, *if it be possible*, shall be here conceived to import an absolute impossibility, the necessity, efficacy, and power of the Lord §. 1.

Christs prediction, and caution, will fall to the ground.]

I answer, 1. That we do not conceive the phrase implies [an absolute impossibility; we acknowledge there is an [absolute impossibility] of the Elects *not being deceived*, if they were left to *themselves*. All that we affirme, is an impossibility of the Elects being deceived, by reason of *Gods preserving them*; not their own power to preserve themselves from being deceived. For which you may please to remember how eagerly you stickled in the close of your former Chapter.

2. That indeed [an absolute impossibility of the Elects being deceived,] would render this caution needlesse, and superfluous; but such an impossibility of their *being deceived*, as we contend for, standing in conjunction with such an impossibility of their not *being deceived*, as we assert, doth not at all work to the making this caution useleſſe.

Well, but you proceed; [According to the known principles, of those with whom you have to do; whether they to whom Christ speaketh thus, knew themselves to be Elect, or no; or whether they were Elect, or no; there could be no great necessity, or occasion, why Christ should thus solemnly arme them against seducers. If they were Elect, the sense of these men is; that whether they were thus armed, or no; they could not have fallen in the day of battel. If they were not Elect; neither this, nor any other armour, or cautionary provision whatsoever, could be able to make them stand, or keep them alive.]

I answer, you are guilty of misrepresenting the sense of the poor men, with whom you are pleased to have more to do then needs: For, 1. We have no such sense, as [that if these men were Elect, they could not have fallen in the day of battel, whether thus armed or no.] What men do we speak of, if they were Elect? We speak, good Sir, of none, but such as are Elect *positive*; and such we confesse cannot [stand in the day of battel,] without the *Spirit of God* supporting their hearts; notwithstanding all *cautions* founded in their *eares*, so farre are we from non-sensing thus gravely; *If the Elect were Elect, they could not fall whether thus armed or no.* 2. Nor have we any such rich non-sense, as [that in case they were not elected; neither this, nor any other armour, nor cautionary provision, could be able to make them stand, and keep them alive.] For we speak of the Elect, *quatenus* Elect; and what then have we to do with this, [in case they were not elected?] true, if the men who are Elect, had not been elected, nothing could have *brought* them to *believe*, much lesse *confirmed* them in believing against such assaults as we speak of; but we speak of them now under the notion of *Elect*; and so long, what have we to do with this, [if they were not elected?] But. 2. If they were not elected, [they were never *alive*;] and so indeed it is true, [nothing could *keep them alive*,] *who were never alive*. But we do not use to talke so ramblingly of [nothing being able to keep alive men not elected,] when as all not elected, are ever *dead in trespasses and sins*; and when they seem to be most *alive*, they have at best but *a name that they are alive, but are indeed dead*. 3. Who of us ever said [any armour, or cautionary provision] was able to keep the Elect themselves [alive?] Good Sir, be pleased to remember that we attribute no such thing as an ability to keep us alive, to any [armour, or cautionary provisions,] whatsoever: We look upon these as *good meanes*, and in their own kinde *sufficient*; but dare not give this honour of *keeping us alive* to any, but the *Spirit of God*, who is as well the *finisher*, as the *Authour* of the faith of all the Elect.

§ 14. See we next whether you *dispute* against our sense better then you *represent* it; [At this turne (say you) it is commonly pleaded, that God willeth as the end, so also the means for the accomplishing of the end; and in the particular in hand, Christ willeth as the non-seducing of the Elect; so also that they should beware of seducers, as a meanes tending to that end.] This, as much as your gravity is pleased to discountenance it, as light, and impertinent, we are ready to make good against your bipartite answer.

1. Say you, [Though it be very true, that God who willeth the end, willeth and prescribeth the meanes also, *viz.* when he declareth the end not to be otherwise

therwiſe attainable, then in, and by the uſe of ſuch means as he preſcribeth, in order hereunto; Yet when he hath irreverſibly decreed, that the end ſhall certainly be obtained, or that he will interpoſe, by an high and irreſiſtible hand, for the effecting of it; and withall hath declared either the one, or the other, or both theſe decrees unto the world; it is now no wayes conſiſting with his wiſdom, to enjoyne men the uſe of any meanes, for the obtaining of this end; eſpecially under the penalty, or threatning of a non-obtaining it.]

I anſwer, that God hath declared the end, in the caſe in hand, *viz.* the ſaving of his Elect, not to be otherwiſe attainable, then in, and by the uſe of ſuch means, as he preſcribeth in order thereunto. And however you are pleaſed to forget it, your poor younger Brethren do alway expreſſe themſelves thus; they do not uſe to dream of *happineſſe* in *heaven* without *holineſſe* on *earth*; of *ſtanding* on *earth* without looking to their *feet*, and *pondering* their *paths*; or, as in the caſe in hand, of being *ſaved* from *ſeducers*, but by *trying* the *ſpirits*, *proving all things*, having recourſe to the *Law*, and the *Teſtimonie*, and to GOD himſelf for his gracious illumination. Nor do any of us allow our ſelves to ſay, [that God hath irreverſibly decreed that the end ſhall certainly be attained, otherwiſe then by the uſe of ſuch means as he hath been pleaſed to appoint in order thereunto,] or [that he will interpoſe with an high and irreſiſtible hand,] otherwiſe then ſo as to help his Elect to *uſe the meanes*, which he hath appointed in order to the obtaining of the *end*. This is all we preſume to ſay, and we are bold to ſay; God hath been pleaſed to declare, the *one* as well as the *other*; that is, that as he hath appointed the *Elect to ſalvation*, ſo he hath appointed to *keep them in the way*, to guide, to guard them, to work in them all that he enjoynes them, in order to ſalvation. But what you mean by ſaying, [then he hath declared, either the one or the other, or both of theſe decrees to the world:] I ſuppoſe you underſtand your ſelf, I dare not take upon me to do it, had you ſaid he hath declared *both* theſe decrees, and added, or [*either* the *one* or *the other*,] my Cap had been capable of receiving your ſenſe; but when you ſay, he hath declared, [either the one or the other, or both of theſe decrees:] I ſuppoſe you have ſome recondite meaning lodged in theſe words, which had not been marſhalled in this order, but upon ſome eſpeciall conſideration, which is above all vulgar apprehenſion.

But what if God have not declared, either both, or either of theſe decrees to the world, for as much as concernes particular men? I truſt my confederates will ſay he hath not, nor told the world who are his Elect, and whom accordingly he will preſerve in faith to ſalvation; and therefore not having declared to the world, who the men are; no, nor alwayes to the men themſelves, whom he hath choſen out of the world, that he hath ſo choſen them; it ſeemes not inconſiſtent with his wiſdome, [to enjoyne men the uſe of means in order to ſalvation, and that under the penalty or threatening of a non-obtainining it;] nor is it impoſſible as you pretend to produce inſtances from the Scripture, where means have been enjoyned upon ſuch termes, that *Acts* 27. *v.* 22. *comp. with ver.* 31. whatever you ayſ reacheth home to the buſineſſe.

I grant you, [that that promiſſory incouragement, that there ſhould be no loſſe of any mans life amongſt them, was but conditional, and not abſolute;] and it appears (as you ſay rightly) by theſe words, *Except theſe abide in the ſhip, ye cannot be ſaved*; and conſequently that the ſaving of their lives did depend upon the Mariners continuing in the ſhip, and that had they not continued in her, they had periſhed.] What of this? ſay *we*, the promiſſory encouragements to all the Elect, are but *conditional* alſo, not *abſolute*, and that *except they believe*, and *repent*, and *beware of ſeducers*, they ſhall *periſh*; and that their *ſalvation* depends upon their *beliefe*, repentance, and bewaring of ſeducers: And yet we adde, that God hath *abſolutely* decreed to give them *belief*, repentance, and grace to beware of ſeducers, and ſo to bring them to ſalvation; to bring them to ſalvation only upon theſe *conditions*, but *abſolutely* to work theſe things in them, which are required, as *conditions*. It amounts to no more but this, *that he will not bring them to ſalvation, till he have*

thus qualified them, and that he will thus qualifie them, in order to ſalvation.

Now I demand, Did God decree, or not decree, that theſe Mariners ſhould ſtay in the ſhip? If he did not decree, did he *concurre* to their ſtaying in the ſhip, to wit, to their changing their purpoſes of going off? If you ſay, he did *not concurre*, you make them independant in this their change, and to work ſo wiſely without being beholding to God; If he *did concurre to it*, he did *decree* to concurre to it, or elſe he did *concur* without *decreeing*; and if he did *decree*, then either *abſolutely*, which is as much as I deſire, or *conditionally*; if ſo, ſhew upon *what condition*. Good Sir, though Gods *promiſe* in this caſe was *conditional*, his *purpoſe* was *abſolute*; that is in order to the *condition*, though not to the *iſſue* of the condition, and ſo it is in our caſe. Gods *promiſe* of *ſalvation* to his Elect, is *conditional*; his *Decree* though, is *abſolute*, in reſpect of the *condition* to give them *firſt*, Faith, Repentance, and Grace to beware of ſeducers, and then *afterwards ſalvation*.

But what if I ſhould ſay, the *promiſe* of the ſafety of *Pauls* companions, was *abſolute?* Your clauſe of, *Except theſe abide in the ſhip, you cannot be ſaved*, would not be enough to overthrow it. For God, for ought you know, promiſed *Paul*, (to him alone the promiſe was made,) that *he would order things* ſo, as that there ſhould *no man be loſt*. But ſure he who promiſed to *ſave* them, did not promiſe to do it, but by the *ordinary way*, viz, by the diligence of the Mariners. But let this paſſe; Conſider we your ſecond anſwer, §. 15. [Though God who willeth the end, willeth and appointeth meanes for the obtaining of the end; yet we cannot ſuppoſe that he exhorteth, and preſſeth men to uſe means, in order to the obtaining of ſuch, or ſuch an end, which himſelf gives aſſurance unto them, they ſhall obtain, whether they uſe the means, or no.]

Who, I beſeech you, among all your poor adverſaries ever dreamt, that God aſſured ſalvation unto his Elect, whether they uſed the meanes or no? I have reſolved not to be angry; elſe I ſhould fall foule on you, for throwing this dirt ſo ſhamleſly in our faces; but I ſhall only minde you how much it concernes you to redeem this ſlander, by an ingenuous acknowledgement, that either you do not underſtand what you oppoſe, or elſe oppoſe againſt what you underſtand; neither is done like Reverend Mr. *Goodwin*, the great Oracle of the Age.

We never ſaid, [*God inſured any man he ſhould be crowned whether he run or no*;] we ſay, he hath decreed to aſſiſt every Saint in his *running*, ſo as he ſhall not miſſe of the *prize*.

§. 16. Well, but againſt this; yet, you reply, [that if God aſſureth no man that he ſhall not be ſeduced; but only in, and by the uſe of meanes, that he may not be ſeduced; then hath God made no peremptory decree, concerning the non-ſeducement of the Elect, nor other, then with which the ſeducement of them may very poſſibly ſtand. For that which depends upon any deliberate, or elective act of the will of man, cannot be ſaid to be poſitively, peremptorily, or abſolutely decreed by GOD.]

I anſwer, 1. That God hath made ſuch decree of the non-deceiving of his Elect, as is abſolute, ſo far as that it ſhall be *effected infallibly*; but not ſo far as that it ſhall be effected *without an act of their will*; but he hath *abſolutely decreed* thoſe *acts of their wills*, which are required to their *non-being deceived*.

Theſe acts of their will in their *own nature*, I grant, are *contingent*, but the decree of God ſuppoſed, they come to paſſe *infallibly*; and God is both able, and ready thus to *fixe the determinations of the wills of his Elect*, notwithſtanding the *uncertainty of them in their own nature*. §. 17. Nor need I produce inſtances in this kinde; for you are pleaſed in the cloſe to grant ſo much, as [that God is able to do it,] though you deny, that he hath decreed to do it, and would bear us in hand, this is all the queſtion. But by your leave, 1. However you are here grown ſo kinde, as to gratifie us with this, [that God is able to do it;] yet all along this Book you deny it. And if God be able to fixe the determinations of the wills of his Saints, ſo as to keep them from being *deceived*; why may he not as well fixe them, ſo as to *undeceive* them infallibly at firſt? The truth is, you ſay, God did not, doth not, cannot go further, then

to

to leave the will at liberty to reſiſt his determinations; but here you are in a good humour, and are content to allow he may, ſo as to keep them from *evil* belike; though not ſo as to bring them to *good*: this is evident in *it ſelf*, (for how elſe doth he confirme the Saints in Heaven?) but not conſiſtent with your ſpeculations, that even the Saints in heaven conſidering the native liberty of their wills, which God cannot fixe, and faſten on one ſide, though the beſt, are in a poſſibility of falling away, though not altogether ſo great, Grammercy, as regenerate men on earth.

I ſmell you out here; You had ſaid in your former Chapter, [that the Saints have ſufficient power to keep themſelves from ſins apparently deſtructive to their ſouls, equal to their propenſion, to preſerve their naturall lives from violence by their own hands, and this by reaſon of the meanes, light, and uſe of reaſon afforded them;] and now this is all you mean belike, that God may by theſe meanes, be ſaid ſo to fixe their determinations; but as for a *work by power* upon *the wills of men*, you have ſhewed the beſt of your ſtrength in diſputing down the poſſibility of it. But whether your ſucceſſe be anſwerable to your endeavours, I refer to the Reader, whom I deſire to peruſe what hath been ſaid by your humble ſervant in this particular.

And for the ſecond, I ſhall eſſay to ſhew, that God hath decreed to ſhew his power in this kinde; and for that purpoſe, I ſhall inſiſt on the next Text, which you attempt to elude, 1 *Pet.* 1. 5.

Another Scripture (you ſay) much diſcourſed in the behalfe of the common doctrine of perſeverance, is 1 *Pet.* 1. 5. *Who are kept by the power of God through faith to ſalvation.* From hence (you go on,) it is frequently concluded, that they who once truly believe, and are regenerated, *v.* 3. are kept by the ingagement of the mighty power of God, from falling away to deſtruction.] §. 18.

I muſt here reply, that we repoſe much confidence in this Scripture, that it will firmly ſupport our Doctrine of perſeverance; but we do not uſe to phraſifie it ſo crudely, as you are pleaſed to do in our behalf. For, 1. We do not uſe to ſay [they who once truly believe and are regenerate;] we think *Regeneration* is to be put before *beliefe*, and that men are *regenerate to faith* rather then *by it*. 2. We do not conclude, as you ſay, from hence, that they who once truly believe, are kept by the engagement of the mighty power of God from falling away to deſtruction;] but ſay, that this which you ſay is frequently [*concluded hence*,] is expreſly *aſſerted here*, abating only your ſupernumerary words; which though they *ſound* ſomewhat more, *ſignifie* but the ſame with thoſe of the Apoſtle. Your [ingagement] weighs no more then his *power*; and your [*mighty power*,] no more then his plaine *power of God*; and your [from falling away to deſtruction,] is all as fully expreſt, in his *unto ſalvation*; only *Peters* language is not quaint enough, nor is his Period ſo numerous, as the more Rhetorical Mr. *Goodwins*. Well, but what hath Mr. *Goodwin* to ſay againſt this [*concluſion*,] as he calls it; or rather againſt this *paraphraſe* of the words? Why, as he never wanted wit to obſcure the cleareſt Text, and to caſt a cloud on the lightſomeſt Scripture; he ſadly tells us,

1. [That it is not here ſaid, that Regenerate men are kept ſimply, and abſolutely by the power of God unto ſalvation; but that they are kept by the power of God *through faith unto ſalvation*; which plainly implies, that the power of God here ſpoken of, engageth for no mans preſervation, or ſafeguarding unto ſalvation; but by the mediation of faith, or any whit longer then their faith ſhall continue. Now here being nothing ſaid, or implied, touching the certainty of the continuance of the faith of the Saints unto the end; nor concerning any engagement of the power of God for the perpetuation thereof; evident it is, that nothing can be concluded from hence, for the eſtabliſhment of the Doctrine of perſeverance.]

I anſwer, this Doctrine is not ſo much *concluded hence*, as *aſſerted here*; and whereas you confidently avouch, that [nothing is here implied touching the certainty of the continuance of the faith of the Saints unto the end:] You may pleaſe to put on your ſpctacles again, and you ſhall eaſily diſcerne that though the Apoſtle

implie, [that the power of God engageth for no mens preſervation unto ſalvation, but by the mediation of faith, or any whit longer then their faith ſhall continue,] (which our Doctrine of Perſeverance, however you are pleaſed to miſreport it, doth conſtantly teach; and addeth, that Gods power engageth for no mens preſervation to ſalvation, but in the uſe of all other holy meanes to ſuppreſſe and ſubvert the power of the old man;) yet he doth expreſſe, that God will keep Beleevers by, or through faith to ſalvation, *i. e.* that he will keep them in *faith*, as the *meanes* to *ſalvation*, as the *end*; and this is that which our Doctrine uſeth to aſſert with the Apoſtle.

2. [Say you, for the ſenſe, and importance of the place, it is this, that men once begotten by God to a lively hope, by the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt from the dead, have, or may have the greateſt ſecurity, which the infinite power of God can afford; that perſevering in that faith unto the end, they ſhall be ſaved.] This is but *part* of the ſenſe, by your leave; God here promiſeth to keep them to the end; and however you would bear us in hand to the contrary; here is not only as much, as in *that*, *He that endureth to the end, ſhall be ſaved*; but as much as in *this*, *He ſhall preſerve me from every evil work unto his heavenly Kingdome.* He here promiſeth to *preſerve* their *faith*, as well as to reward it. And when you make the words to importe leſſe, you evacuate the greateſt part of their *meaning*, and the Beleevers *comfort*.

I grant you [your Expoſition perfectly accords with that part of *Bullingers* Commentary,] which you quote; but [that part of his Commentary,] is ſhort of the *whole ſenſe* of the Apoſtles Text. And when you inferre from *Bullingers* [*modo ne nos deficiat fides*, 1. A poſſibility that our preſent faith may faile us. 2. That in caſe it faile us, we periſh, notwithſtanding any thing aſſerted by the Apoſtle, concerning *our being kept by the power of God unto ſalvation.*]

I anſwer, 1. That there is not only a *poſſibility* that our faith ſhould faile; but an *impoſſibity* that it ſhould not faile, were we left to our *ſelves*. But that this notwithſtanding, God hath engaged his power to preſerve our faith, and Chriſt hath prayed for all the Elect, as he did for *Peter*, that their *faith may not faile: Holy Father, keep through thine own Name, thoſe whom thou haſt given me, that they may be one as we are one*; that is, in the unity of *faith* as well as *charity*.

And, 2. That as there is ſuch a *poſſibility* of our *faiths failing*, ſo a *neceſſity* of our *periſhing* in caſe our *faith ſhould faile*; but God hath given us ſecurity, that he will preſerve our *faith*, that our *ſoules* may not periſh. And this is that which the Apoſtle affirmes here, that Believers are kept *by the power of God through faith*, as the *meanes*, unto *ſalvation*, as the end; that he who is the *Author* will be the *Finiſher* of their faith. And were it otherwiſe, conſidering what is the *weakneſſe* of Beleevers, when they are *ſtrongeſt*; what, the *ſtrength* of Satan, when laid *loweſt*, and moſt *bruiſed under* our *feet*, while we are here on earth; we had but a *feeble comfort*, notwithſtanding all the *power of God*; and might we too rationally reply, True, we ſhall be preſerved from *periſhing*, if we *perſevere* in *believing*; but we are apt at every turne to loſe our *faith*, and then what becomes of our *ſalvation*? our *Anchor* is apt to *faile*, and then where is our *ſalvation*? what remaines but a *ſhipwrack* of our poor *ſoules*? and we, who hoped we had been *eſtabliſhed upon the Rock*, how are we *ſplit againſt it*? *You* who bear men in hand, they have enough in *themſelves*, to ſecure them of their continuance in faith, may upon your ground bid them be of good chear, in that Gods power will keep them to ſalvation, if they keep themſelves in *faith*. But we who are conſcious to our ſelves, how great a mixture of unbelief our faith doth alwayes admit, when it is at beſt; cannot ſatisfie our ſelves with leſſe then this, that we have *Gods power* engaged to *preſerve our faith*.

§. 3. 1. You tell us, [you have broken the heart of this objection of uncomfortableneſſe in your former Chapter;] but we have ſeen there, that this objection is ſtrong enough to break the *hearts* of all *Believers*, had they no better anſwer then you make it; what you produce [of Believers inclinations to preſerve their ſpiri-

tuall

tual life, of equal ſtrength with thoſe of mens, to preſerve their natural life,] hath been anſwered already; and had I ſaid nothing to it, yet had it been too fully, and confuted by the ſaid experience of all ages.

2. You adde [that though God hath not ſimply and abſolutely undertaken for their perſeverance, or continuation of their faith unto the end, nor upon any ſuch termes, but that if they will be brutiſhly, and deſperately careleſſe, of ſo high a concernment to themſelves, as a *bleſſed* eternity is, they may make defection from it, and turn Proſelytes to hell, yet hath he laid a rich foundation for their perſeverance, in thoſe many precious promiſes and encouragements, which he hath given unto thoſe who ſhall perſevere; as alſo in thoſe moſt ſevere and dreadful threatenings, bent againſt the faces of all Apoſtates, and backſliders, together with thoſe frequent promiſes and declarations which he hath made, to continue, yea, and to inlarge upon occaſion, the inward contributions of his Spirit, the motions, excitements, and directions thereof, in order to the plentiful inabling his Saints to perſevere, untill they ſhall willingly and wilfully turn their backs upon them, and reject them.]

I anſwer, 1. That had not God undertaken ſimply for their perſeverance, or continuation of their faith unto the end, they would ſoon be even [brutiſhly careleſſe of their ſalvation,] and the Saints are all conſcious to themſelves, of ſo much [careleſneſſe, ever and anon, that they are alwayes ready to ſay with *David*, *So fooliſh were we* and *ignorant even as it were a beaſt before thee*; alas, for the Saints have not ſuch *conceits* of themſelves, as to forget what *deceit* they carry in their boſomes, ſuch hearts as have too much in them, to *deceive themſelves*, yea, to be *deceived by others*, and often take an unhappy pleaſure in *undoing themſelves*, & are trifling away a *bleſſed immortality* for *inconſiderable vanities*. One part of the beſt man, is worſe then [brutiſh] no better then *Deviliſh*. There is no *man* ſo regenerate, but that he hath an *unregenerate* part in him; and no *part* of any regenerate man, is ſo regenerate to the full, but that that *regenerate part* hath an *unregenerate part*, ſecretly couching under it; and it doth appear, in that, that *unregenerate part* doth untowardly mixe it ſelfe with the moſt *perfect actions* of the *perfecteſt men* on earth, who muſt all ſay, *All our righteouſneſſes are as filthy rags, our righteouſneſſes all of* them are as *rags*, that is *broken* and *torne*; and as *filthy rags*, *polluted* and *ſtinking*: yea, as *menſtruous rags*, of all other filthy ones the moſt *loathſome*. What Saint is there on record in Gods book, but betrayed his failings to a high degree in that very *grace*, for which the holy Ghoſt hath thought fit to ſet him forth as the moſt eminent example? *Moſes* the *meekeſt man on earth*, how *unadviſedly did he ſpeak with his lips?* and *Job* the Grand mirror of patience, ſuch a one as ſome have been pleaſed to take him for an embleme onely, as doubting whether fleſh and blood were capable of being exalted to ſuch a tranſcendent height of patience; how did he *curſe the day of his birth*, and in a higher exorbitancy, undertake to manage a *diſpute* againſt God? it was [brutiſhneſſe] with a witneſſe, for *man* to challenge *God* to anſwer an argument, and as thinking he had *ſo much reaſon* on his ſide, ſhewed he had *none at all*. Good Sir, the Saints confeſſe it is onely Gods *care* that keeps them from being [careleſſe;] and bleſſed be his Name, he *is God, and not man*, or elſe they would be the beſt of them all, not *men*, but *beaſts*; how would *infidelity* ſteale upon them, ſo farre as to lurch them of their reaſon, and that upon a pretence of adding to it? how would *envy* eat out their Charity, and brave it in the place of it? they know *the Scripture ſaith not in vain*, *The ſpirit that dwelleth in them, luſteth to envy*. And this is a ſinne which is of principal *acceptance in hell*, and renders them not ſimply *Proſelytes*, but ſingular *proficients* in theſe black arts; this is a ſinne that is enough to make the beſt of men, not onely careleſſe of their own; high concernments, but ſtudious for the drawing of others into the deepeſt miſchiefes; and to undervalue the happineſſe they may have in their own enjoyments, in compariſon of the more precious felicity, in hindering of others; as long as this evill ſpirit dwells (as it doth in all men, more or leſſe, while they dwell on earth,) had not Gods good Spirit undertaken for the perſeverance of the Saints, it would caſt out all the *graces* they have received, and if it were not in a capacity to do it *alone*, it would call in, if it might be, *ſeven worſe ſpirits* to aſſiſt it. Upon theſe conſiderations

we

we are bold to conceive, nothing can ſecure the Saints from danger, and ſo from fear of Apoſtaſy; but this, that God hath ſimply, and abſolutely undertaken for their perſeverance.

2. Yet do we not ſay, that God hath undertaken for it ſo abſolutely, as that [though they ſhould grow bruitiſhly careleſſe of ſo high a concernment, they ſhould not make defection,] this *careleſneſs* is a *defection*, but that he hath ſo farre undertaken, as to take care, they ſhall not be given up to ſuch a *degree of* careleſneſſe, and that as prone as *they* are to forget both *him* and *themſelves*, he will ſtill graciouſly remember *them*, and *keep them in faith unto ſalvation.*

3. And were it not for this, how little could they build [on that rich foundation] you ſpeak of, for their perſeverance, that [rich foundation] notwithſtanding, they were in a *poor caſe*, God wot? for, 1. What ſpeak you of the [precious promiſes God hath given to thoſe which ſhall perſevere?] is not the *fleſhly* part of the moſt *ſpiritual* man, apt to be more taken with the paultry offers of the world, and the fleſh? eſpecially when more ſolemnly ſet forth, to the beſt advantage with the Rhetorick of Satan? what ſpeak you of [encouragements from heavenly treaſures, inheritances, and crownes, in compariſon of thoſe which are given by *earthly ones?* I wis, *theſe* are more *viſible*, as being *nearer hand*; *thoſe* are leſſe in the *eye*, becauſe of the *diſtance*; *theſe* may be had in *preſent poſſeſſion*, nothing but a *reverſion*, and that after our *own lives* can be expected of the other: and though to a [conſidering Saint, theſe heavenly things appear infinitely more to be valued;] yet the moſt conſidering Saint, hath fleſh enough in him to take him off from conſidering them, eſpecially when it hath lulled him halfe aſleep, and more, in the bewitching embraces of any ſenſual pleaſure; witneſſe no meaner Saints then *David*, and *Solomon*; *Carnal pleaſures* made them forget all *ſpiritual delights*; and while they repoſed their *heads* in the *boſomes* of their *Concubines*, they did not as much as *dream* of that of *Abraham*; theſe *Syrenes* ſo inchanted them, that they forgot honour, profit, their bodies, their ſoules, heaven, and all. They were ſo cunningly bewitched by theſe *Circes*. *Luſt* is ſo ſottiſh, that it fancieth no happineſſe, like that which alone can give *it ſelfe* ſatisfaction; ſo little is it wont to weigh the [incouragements] you ſpeak of. 2. No nor are the [moſt ſevere, and dreadful threatenings bent againſt the face of all Apoſtates] enough to ſcare the *luſts* from purſuing their game, did not the *Spirit* of God interpoſe more effectually, then their own *reaſon*; which is imployed by the *luſts* to diminiſh thoſe *threatenings*, as if they were but *ſcarcrowes*, or *vizards*; the *fire of luſt* makes that of *hell* ſeem but *cold*; nor doth it fear the *lake of brimſtone*, while it may *ſwim in a river of pleaſure*; but what mean you, 3. By thoſe [frequent Promiſes and Declarations God hath made to continue, and upon occaſion to inlarge the inward contributions of his Spirit? the motions, excitements, and directions thereof?] It is true, God hath done ſo, and that is all the ground of the Saints hope; but *you* of all men, have no reaſon to mention it, as who deny that the Spirit *works by power*, and in a *Phyſical way*, as your blunt adverſaries are wont to ſpeak, but onely by *exhortations* and *arguings*, and theſe are meerly preſented to the *eare*, not immediately carried into the *ſoul*: for when all ſuch [contributions] are afforded, the Saints are not ſo plentifully enabled to perſevere, but that according to your principles, they have a power to turn their backs on them; and ſhould they be diveſted of this *power*, how were they injuriouſly robbed of that liberty, which you make to be their eſpecial priviledge, *as men?* They were not *men* I wis, unleſſe they had a power thus to play the *beaſts*. Hitherto then your [rich foundation] is but ſo much ſand, nor can you raiſe ſuch a ſtructure upon it, as whence the Saints may ever hope to reach unto *heaven*.

But ſay you [Upon this account, the Apoſtle *Paul* frequently incourageth the Saints, to the hope and expectation of the effectual accompliſhment of their perſeverance;] he doth indeed, but upon the account of Gods *Promiſes to keep the Saints*, not upon the account of their own *ability to keep themſelves* upon [any Promiſes and Declarations] whatſoever. *The Lord is faithfull who ſhall ſtabliſh you, and keep you from evill.* 2 *Theſ.* 3. 3. How but by his own power? as in the Text under debate, *who ſhall alſo confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameleſt in the day of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.*

Chriſt; how but by his own power, (in the Text under conſideration) engaged to preſerve them through faith to ſalvation?

You meerly weaken this confirmation by what you adde, [God according to the common Dialect of Scripture-language, is ſaid to eſtabliſh, confirme, and keep men from evil, when he doth that which is of a proper tendency, and ſufficient thereunto, whether the effect, or ends themſelves of eſtabliſhment, confirmation, &c. be actually obtained or no;] And ſo the Saints have ſuch a *confirmation*, i. e. *on Gods part*, as may ſtand with *confuſion on their own*; and where then is the *comfort* of this *confirmation?* What are they the better for being ſo *eſtabliſhed by God*, as that notwithſtanding all his eſtabliſhing, they may fall, and ſink of *themſelves?* What, for being *ſo kept by him*, as that they may notwithſtanding be *loſt in themſelves?* We indeed give them this bleſſed comfort; that though they may, and are ſtill in danger of falling, and periſhing in *themſelves*; yet they ſhall be eſtabliſhed and preſerved by *God*: and ſo we make Gods power for their preſervation, a ground of comfort, while we lay their *own weakneſſe* as a ground of *humility*; you contrariwiſe lay their *own liberty* as a ground of *diſcomfort*, notwithſtanding all *Gods power* to preſerve them; and *promiſes* to exerciſe that power, and *faithfulneſſe* to performe thoſe promiſes of preſerving them.

Thus do you but ſo confirme them, as that you *undermine their confirmation*, and ſeeming at firſt to *build* up their *hope* with one hand, you preſently after *break* it down with another. To what elſe tends your comparing Gods confirming the Saints, with a [mans cauſing his wife to commit fornication?] God confirmes his Saints belike no otherwiſe, by *knitting* their hearts to *himſelf*; then a man cauſeth his wife to commit fornication, when he *cuts her off from himſelf* by a bill of *divorce*. Or your comparing [Gods confirming his Saints with a mans deſtroying his weak brother? as the man is ſaid to deſtroy his brother, though he be not deſtroyed; ſo God confirmes the Saints, though they be not confirmed.] Reverend Sir, the caſes are wide in thoſe paſſages, he deſtroyeth his brother, and he cauſeth his wife to commit adultery; There is eyed only the *guilt* of the perſons that *do the one or the other*, not the *eſtate* of the perſons *againſt whom the one or the other is done*; but in this, *God will eſtabliſh and keep you*, is eyed the *comfort of the Saints* to whom God is pleaſed to engage himſelf for their keeping. Now though in the *other* paſſages, the men who do what *tends to the one or the other*, be abſolutely *guilty*, though the things *be not done*; yet in *this* the Saints are not *comforted*, (which is that which the Apoſtle intends,) unleſſe the effect upon *their part* really anſwer the act *upon Gods*. And thus have you but committed *fornication with your own invention*, and deſtroyed your buſineſſe by over-acting it.

Well, but [in this Idiom of ſpeaking, God expreſſely ſaith, *He hath purged Jeruſalem, yet ſhe was not purged*; True, but in this God ſpeaks to the condemnation of a rebellious people, and he had done enough to render them *inexcuſable for their filthineſſe*; albeit through their own *frowardneſſe* their *filthineſſe* continued, perhaps increaſed, by that which ſhould have purged it, But in this of eſtabliſhing he ſpeaks to his *choſen people* for their *comfort*, which would be none at all, conſidering how apt they are of *themſelves* to *fall*, notwithſtanding all *outward meanes*; did not God inwardly work, and *irreſiſtibly effect their confirmation*. In the *one*, God chargeth *rebellious* men with *their wickedneſſe*, notwithſtanding *his goodneſſe*, in the *other* he *comforts good men* with *his own goodneſſe*, notwithſtanding *their wickedneſſe*, which he engageth himſelf to ſubdue.

Albeit [his acting, in a way of ſufficient tendency, without effecting,] be enough to *charge thoſe with ſin*; yet nothing leſſe then *his effecting*, is enough to *comfort theſe againſt ſin*.

Laſtly, What though, [Chriſt be ſtiled *the Lamb of God, which taketh away the ſinnes of the world* and yet all the ſin of the world, be not taken away?] It is enough that all *that ſin* which is taken away, is taken away by *him*; and had none been actually taken away, which, you ſay elſewhere, was *not impoſſible*; he could not, in good *congruity*, have been ſaid to *have taken it away*. Nor can God be ſaid to have eſtabliſhed

ſtabliſhed the Saints, unleſſe ſome of the Saints at leaſt had been *actually eſtabliſhed*; and if *ſome* have been, then *may all* be ſo eſtabliſhed; and if they *may*, then they *ſhall*, Gods promiſe to *all* being *alike gracious*. All this which you have ſaid, to ſhew how [God may be ſaid to eſtabliſh, to confirme men unto the end, to keep them from falling; though men neither be actually, or in the event eſtabliſhed, confirmed, and kept from evil;] doth but evacuate theſe promiſes, and ſo tends only to the prejudice, and diſparagement unto the grace and goodneſſe of God, or to his power, or effectualneſſe of working in this behalf; and ſo the enfeebling, and weakening of the comfort of the Saints, contrary to the intention of the Spirit of God.

§ 21. The next Scripture which [you undertake to right] the wrong way, againſt thoſe who have done it, [the injury] as you term it, [in fathering the common Doctrine of Perſeverance upon it,] is 1 *John* 2.19. *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: But they went out, that they might be made manifeſt, that they were not all of us.* From hence you ſay, this inference is drawn up, *That they who are of the Saints*, i. e. *of the number of true, and reall Saints, will alwayes continue in this number, and never Apoſtatize.* But for anſwer you tell us,

[Firſt, That this inference preſumeth many things, for which neither it, nor any of the Authours of it, can give any ſecurity of proof; As

1. That this phraſe, *they were not of us*, imports, *they never were true Believers*; this (you ſay) can never be proved, becauſe there is another ſenſe; and this every whit as proper to the words, and more commodious to the context, and ſcope of the place, which may be given of them, as we ſhall ſee anon.] When you ſhew it us, you ſhall receive our anſwer; in the mean time I prove that this phraſe, *they were not of us*, containes what our aſſociates in this Doctrine of Perſeverance, are wont to affirme. For theſe here ſpoken of, were of the Diſciples of Chriſt, and Beleevers in profeſſion, *of us* in that ſenſe; elſe could they not be ſaid to *go out from us*, in any ſenſe. How they ſhould *go out* of your company, who never were *of it*, goes beyond the apprehenſion of all but ſuch refined wits as Maſter *Goodwins*.

And therefore, 2. They are ſaid *not to be of us*, only in this ſenſe, that they were but Beleevers in *ſhew*, not in *truth*; were as thoſe that are ſaid to be *of Iſrael*, but not *Iſrael*; were as *goates* in the flock of *ſheep*, as *diſſemblers* in the ſociety of *ſincere* Chriſtians.

And therefore, 3. They *never were true Beleevers*: for elſe the Apoſtles would have ſaid they were *once* of us, but *now* are not of us; but he ſaith they *were not of us*, i. e. neither at *laſt* nor at *firſt*, but from the beginning were but feigning *pretenders*, not reall *partners* in our faith.

[Secondly, That this phraſe, *they were of us*, ſignifies that they were true Beleevers. Of the uncertainty of this *ſuppoſition*, (you ſay) you will give the like account.] But by your leave, in the *Text* is no ſuch word as that, *they were of us*; in our *inference* there is no ſuch ſuppoſition as that *they were true Beleevers*; Yea, we affirme the clean contrary, that they never were true Beleevers; and ſo in that ſenſe, *never were of us*. With what ſobriety can you affirme, that we have an odde [ſuppoſition, that theſe who are ſaid *not to be of us*, were once *ſo of us* as to be true Beleevers?] Whereas *we* maintaine, that *had they been once of us* in this ſenſe, they could *never have gone out from us*, nor ever have *backſlided*, had they at any time *ſtood*; had they *once* ſtood *right*, we ſay they had for *ever* ſtood *faſt*.

Thirdly], That theſe words, *They went out from us*, ſignifie their finall deſertion, or abdication of the Apoſtles communion, or their total, and final renunciation of Chriſt, his Church, and Goſpel. This ſuppoſition (you ſay) hath no bottome at all, or colour for it.]

I anſwer, theſe words, *They went out from us*, ſignifie no leſſe in *this* place, whatever they may in others: And I [bottome] my aſſertion upon this, that the

the Apoſtle calls them *Antichriſts*, that is, more then *deſerters*, or [*renouncers* of Chriſt, his Church, and Goſpel] oppoſers, defiers of them. He ſaith not, they were *Antichriſtian*, ſuch may be *miſled*; but *Antichriſts*, that is, *leaders* of the curſed *factions*; ſuch as were the *primipili*, or *anteſignani* of thoſe *black regiments*, ſuch as *crucified Chriſt again, put him to an open ſhame*, and did no leſſe then *deſpight to the Spirit of Grace*, and how ſuch ſhould be *renewed again to repentance*; though Mr. *Goodwin* may upon better conſideration finde it to be out of the line of [not poſſibility;] *we* confeſſe we are of that dull Apoſtles judgement, who held it *impoſſible*, *Heb.* 6. 4, 6.

[Fourthly, That this clauſe, *They would no doubt have continued with us*, ſignifies, they would have continued in the ſame faith, wherein we continue, and perſevere; nor is there any competent reaſon to inforce this ſenſe of theſe words, becauſe neither doth the Grammatical tenor of them require it, and much leſſe the ſcope of the paſſage, of which in due time.]

I anſwer, that this clauſe, *They would no doubt have continued with us*; can ſignifie no leſſe, then that they would have continued in the *ſame faith* with us, unleſſe it may ſignifie *nothing at all*. For to *continue with us* in any other ſenſe, is no better then *not to continue*. What ſhould they get by *continuing with us in place*, while they *departed from us in judgement, affection?* What advantage had it been to *continue with us in outward company*, and be inwardly confederate with our grand *enemie againſt us?* No doubt, but this, *no doubt they would have continued with us*, is oppoſed to their *going out from us*, and that being ſhewed above to be a *departing from the faith*; this *continuing* can be no other then a *conſtant* and *ſteddy adhering to it*, and *maintenance of it*.

[Fifthly, The ſaid inference ſuppoſeth, that *John* certainly knew that all thoſe who for the preſent remained in his Communion, were true Believers; for if they were not true Beleevers, they that were gone out from them, in the ſenſe contended for, might be ſaid to be *of them*, *i. e.* perſons in the ſame condition with them. But how improbable this is, that *John* ſhould infallibly know, that all thoſe who yet continued with them, were true Beleevers: I referre to Conſideration.]

I anſwer, that upon a little [conſideration,] I diſcover the inconſideration of impoſing on *John* ſuch an infallible knowledge, according to our inference; [That all thoſe that remained in his Communion, were true Believers.] Doth it follow, that becauſe *all that were true Believers, would continue in his Communion*; Ergo *all that continued in his Communion, were true Beleevers?* or that, becauſe *none but ſuch as were not true Believers, did fall from his Communion*; Ergo *all ſuch as were not true Beleevers, did fall from it?* becauſe *none but falſe Brethren deſerted him*; Ergo *all that remained with him, were true Brethren?* I referre this to the [conſideration] of any ordinary mans Logick.

And whereas you ſay, [for if they were not true Beleevers, then they who continued in his Communion, then they that were gone from him, in the ſenſe contended for, might be ſaid to *be of them*, i.e. perſons in the ſame condition with them.] I humbly conceive, it is one thing to ſay, *They who continued in his Communion, were not all true Believers*; another to ſay, *they were none of them open revolters.* They might be *open profeſſours*, yet *ſecret unbelievers*; joyne in *Communion with him*, (which was more then theſe who went out, now did;) yet *unbelievers*, (which was, by your leave, leſſe then theſe who went out.) Theſe were not only *deſerters*, but *deſpiſers* of this Communion; did not only *forſake*, but *oppoſe* this Communion; not only *not believe*, but *belie* the truth, and thus is there no reaſon, why we ſhould acknowledge the genuinneſſe of your inference, or your ingenuity in inferring it from our expoſition, or rather inforcing it upon it.

[Sixthly, The inference under conteſt (ſay you) doth yet further ſuppoſe, that *John* certainly knew that they who were *now gone out from them*, neither were *now* nor *ever* before true Believers; yea, and that he certainly knew this by their departure, or going out from them.] It doth, and what I pray is the dangerous conſequence

of asserting it; you say nothing of it, nor need I say any thing. Their *going out*, that is, in such a way as to set themselves against the Church and her principal Doctrine, (for this is a *meiosis*, and lesse is expressed then is intended,) shewes they were *never truly in*; it's only the *chaffe* that *flies* off, none of the *graines* of *Wheat* but *stay behinde*. They who *forsake their colours*, so as to *fight under the enemies banner*, and charge most desperately in their *forlorne*, were never *true* to the cause for which they pretended to *engage*.

[Seventhly, and lastly, (say you) it presumeth yet further, that all true Believers do alwayes abide in the external Communion of the Church, and that when men do not so abide, they plainly declare hereby, that they never were true Beleevers.] Soft, this *going out*, is more then a *non-abiding* in the Communion, as before no lesse then an advancing against it; it signifies not only a *falling from the Communion*, but a *rising against it*. These that went out were not only *Apostats*, but *Antichrists*. Now though it be possible that *true Believers* may in some cases become *Apostates*, in *part*, for a *time*, and *go out* in that sense, and returne again; yet they *never become Antichrists*, priding themselves in *heading* a partie against the Church; or if perhaps they may do it for *a time* in some *lesse fundamental articles*, yet never against the *principal stone*, and *head of the corner*, as did these here spoken of. Such as *these* when *once they go out*, *never returne*, and shew they were *never faithful to the cause*; in that they did not only secretly betray it, but openly appear in *armes against it*. All *true Beleevers*, though they abide not alwayes in the *external Communion of the Church*; yet they alwayes are preserved from an *internal malicious opposition of it*. We acknowledge indeed that true Beleevers may fall so *foule*, and so *farre*, that [the Church according to the command of Christ, may be constrained to testifie that she cannot tolerate them in her external communion, nor that ever they shall have any part, or portion in the Kingdome of Christ, unlesse they repent:] but what is this to the case of the *Antichrists* in our Text? The *Church* may thus *testifie* against *true Beleevers*, and those *true Beleevers submit* to the *Church* and by the *Churches testifying against them*, be happily brought to *repentance*.

But these Antichrists *testified against the Church*, and *condemned* the *Church*. There is a vast difference between the *spirits of Beleevers condemned by the Church*, and *relenting with grief*, and these Antichrists *condemning* the Church, and *triumphing with pride*. Yea, but say you, [Doubtlesse to be cast out of the Church, according to the institution and command of Christ, (who commands no such thing;) but upon very heynous and highly unchristian misdemeanours, is every whit of as sad an importance, as a voluntary desertion of the Churches Communion can be, especially for a season.]

I make a great question of what you so confidently affirme with a [doubtless;]

For, 1. The [*highest misdemeanour*, for which a man (according to Christs institution,) is cast out of the Church,] is not of the same *altitude* with a mans *casting himself out of the Church*, and *casting all the filth and stones* he can in the *face* of the Church. It argues somewhat *lesse malice*, whatever his [*misdemeanour*] be, that he needs be *cast out*, or else that he would still *hold communion with the Church*; yea, that the *casting out* is a *punishment* to him, and therefore he sets some *price* and *value* on the *Communion of the Church*, contrary to what these Antichrists did.

2. When a man is [cast out of the Church for the highest misdemeanour according to Christs institution,] this *casting out* is done in *mercy*, and with charitable intentions; It is the *Churches compassion* to *exclude* a man from her *Communion*, that he may be *received in again* with the more *comfort*. To *cast him from her self*, that she may *present him to Christ* so much the better; that *the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord*. And as it was in the case of *one* at *Corinth*, so doubtlesse it hath been of *many* elsewhere; their *casting out*, was their *casting down*; and their *casting down*, was their *raising up*, and better setling in the Church. They were *cast out for a season*, that they might be *entertained the more sweetly for ever*: but where a man

casts

casts himself out, and addes *opposition* to his *desertion*, there is no returne to be expected. He that *casts himself out*, can never *call himself in*: nor do we finde where God hath given such grace to such wretched despisers of his Ordinances, and their own salvation.

A mans being *cast out*, is a *punishment*, his *casting out himself*, is a *sin*; and without offence to your [doubtlesse,] no *punishment* is [every whit of so sad an importance,] as *sin*. Yea, for a man to cast himself out, is to inflict on *himself* the saddest punishment which the Church can do; and look how much more *wilfully he doth* it, so much the greater is his *misery*, as well as his *miscarriage*. His *inflicting this punishment on himself*, deserves the Church should *inflict a greater punishment* n *him*, were she capable of inflicting it. The man in this case is *felo de se*, and that is, of [sadder importance,] then to be guilty of murthering *another*; and thus for a man to *cast out himself*, is of sadder importance then to *cast out another*, and much more then to be *cast out*. He may be *cast out*, and yet retain a *thirsting* and a *longing* desire after the Ordinances; he cannot *cast out himself* without *contemning* them. Now look of how much more sad importance it is to *deride* the Ordinances, then to be *deprived* of them; of so much lesse sad importance it is for a man to be *cast out*, then to *cast himself out* of the Churches Communion: No man ever *casting himself out* of the Church, without *casting about*, how to *cast down* the Church, and siding with the *Gates of Hell against it*.

[7. (Say you) Suppose these two Suppositions be granted to the inference makers.

First, that this phrase, *to go out from us*, signifies voluntarily to forsake the Communion of Christians.

And secondly, that this expression to *be of us*, signifies true and inward communion with those, from whom they went out; yet will not these contributions suffice for the firme building of the said inference. The reason is, because the Apostle saith, *That they would have continued with us*; not that they would have continued, such as they were, in respect of the truth, or essence of their faith.

And if the Apostles scope were to prove, or affirme, that *they who are once true Christians, or Believers, alwayes continue such*; then when he saith, *They would have continued with us*, he must of necessity mean, either that they would have continued faithful, as we continue faithful; or else that they would have continued alwayes in our society, or in the profession of Christianity. But that neither of these senses is of any tolerable consistency, is evident by the light of this consideration, *viz.* that the Apostle then must have known, that the persons he speaks of, and who went out from them, neither were, nor ever had been true Beleevers when they thus went out from them. Now if he had this knowledge of them, it must be supposed, either that he had it by extraordinary Revelation, which is not to be proved; or else that he obtained this knowledge by their departure, or going out from them. But that he could not have it hence, is evident, because it may easily, and doth frequently come to passe, that they who are true Christians, do not always continue in that Christian society, unto which they have once joyned themselves, and adhered, no nor yet in the external profession of Christianity it self; yea, and our opposers themselves, frequently, and without scruple teach, *That even true Believers themselves may either through fear*, or *shame*, or *extremity of sufferings*, or *the like*, be *brought to deny Christ*, and without any danger of making *shipwrack of their faith*, forbear a profession-making of the Name of Christ afterwards.]

Here is much ado to shew we shall get no great matter by [your grant of two Suppositions. 1. That *to go out from us*, signifies voluntarily to forsake the Communion of Christians. And, 2. That *to be of us*, signifies true and inward communion; and the reason of our making so small earnings of it is, that the Apostle saith only, they *would have continued with us*; not that they would have continued such as they were in respect of the truth, and essence of their faith.]

But, say I, this, that *they would have continued with us*; the Apostle could not have concluded from lesse then this, *if they were of us*, in this sense, that they were of

inward communion with us, or of true faith; for ſure all others are very apt *not to continue with us*, viz. in *the outward communion*; and though this be *leſſe then may be concluded*, yet this cannot be *concluded from leſſe*: For whereas you ſay, [that neither ſenſes, either that they would have continued faithful, or in the profeſſion of Chriſtianity at leaſt, is of tolerable conſiſtency.] The light of [your conſideration, whereby you pretend to make it evident,] is to me extreamly obſcure: For why might not the Apoſtle know, that the perſons ſpoken of were *never true Believers*, and that without extraordinary Revelation, even upon their departure, or Apoſtaſie? ſay you, [They who are true Chriſtians, do not alwayes continue in that Chriſtian ſociety, whereunto they have joyned themſelves;] True, not in that *particular ſociety*, they do in the *general ſociety of Chriſtians*. No, ſay you [nor yet in the externall profeſſion of Chriſtianity it ſelf;] poſſibly it may be ſo, that [they may renounce it (as you ſay) we yield, through fear, or ſhame, or extremity of ſufferings;] but here appears no ground whereon you may affirme, that theſe Antichriſts, were either *frighted*, *ſhamed*, or *beaten* from their profeſſion; but that they forſook it *wilfully* and *preſumptuouſly*. It is one thing to be brought *upon ſufferings* to deny Chriſt, another to do it *obſtinately* and *deſperately*, ſo as to *perſecute others* for profeſſing him; at leaſt to *deride* and *ſcorne* their *profeſſion*, or to *diſpute* againſt it as theſe Antichriſts did. And whereas you conclude [that we affirme that men may without any danger of making ſhipwrack of their faith, forbear a profeſſion-making of the Name of Chriſt.]

1. There is difference between [forbearing a profeſſion-making of the Name of Chriſt,] and *oppoſing the profeſſion of the Name of Chriſt*, which theſe Antichriſts did.

And, 2. We never ſay, [*That men may forbear the profeſſion-making of the Name of Chriſt, without danger of making ſhipwrack of their faith.*] Albeit we yield, they may in ſome caſes, without making *actual* ſhipwrack of it.

In ſhort, thoſe Antichriſts did *more* then make *ſhipwrack of their own faith*, no *leſſe* then turne *Pirates*, and, as it were, *chaſe the faith of their late Brethren*. Now ſaith the Apoſtle, *This they would not have done*, had *they been of us*; in what ſenſe, I pray? in outward profeſſion? No, it is too clear; that many who have gone for *ſheep*, have ſhewed themſelves *wolves*, and made *havock of the flock*; ſo that he could not conclude, men would not do the like from any leſſe ſuppoſition, then that they were true and real Beleevers; true *ſheep*, not only in *ſheeps cloathing*.

§. 23. 3. I come next to conſider what you deliver, as the true meaning of the place; [The Apoſtles intent in the words (ſay you) was, to prevent, or beale an offence, that weak Brethren might take at that Doctrine which was taught, and ſpread abroad by thoſe Antichriſts; and that eſpecially, becauſe they had ſometimes converſed with the Apoſtles themſelves in Chriſtian Churches, and had profeſſed the ſame faith with them. By reaſon hereof ſome Chriſtians might be apt to think, that ſurely all things were not well with the Apoſtles, and thoſe Chriſtian ſocieties; but that there was ſomewhat amiſſe, either in doctrine, or manners, or both, which miniſtred occaſion to theſe men to leave them. To this the Apoſtle anſwers, partly by Conceſſion, partly by Exception: By Conceſſion, theſe words, *They went out from us*, which do not ſo much import their utter declining, or forſaking the Apoſtles Communion; (though there be an expreſſion following, which probably doth,) but the advantage which they had, to gain credit to their Doctrine, and perſons amongſt profeſſours of Chriſtianity, in as much as they *came forth* from the Apoſtles themſelves, as men taught, and commiſſioned by them to teach. The ſame phraſe is uſed in this ſenſe, *Act.* 15. 24. *Certain which went out from us, have troubled you with words, &c.* ſo that in this clauſe, *they went out from us*, the Apoſtle grants, 1. That thoſe Antichriſtian teachers had for a time held communion with them. And, 2. That hereby they had the greater opportunity, of doing harme by their falſe Doctrine.]

This [Conceſſion] which you ſuppoſe, I cannot yield; for that *ſhall* cannot be the ſenſe of the words, *they went out from us*, I prove thus: to theſe words, *they*

went

went out from us, are opposed these, *They would have continued with us.* Now these words, *They would have continued with us*, cannot be opposed to *going out* as you would carry it, [upon a commission to teach;] but meerely to going out, as it signifies *deserting* or *abandoning* the Apostles Doctrine. Else to have continued with the Apostles, when they were *sent abroad* to *teach*, had been a *fault*; but the Apostle speaks of *continuing* as a *fruit of faith.* And this may suffice to shew your [Concession] is *gratis dictum*, and worse; not only wants ground under its feet, but hath enough to sinke it. Certainly they went out, though it be not repeated in the Original; yet must be supplied, as it is by our translatours; and in the second place, it can bear no other sense but *deserting.* Now to the second part (wherein you say)

[The Apostle answers further by way of Exception, *But they were not of us*, i.e. whiles they conversed with us, they were not men of the same spirit or principles with us, &c.] It is very true; [the Apostles and the rest of the true Beleevers walked in the profession of the Gospel with upright hearts, not aiming at any secular greatnesse; but these Antichrists finding that the simplicity of the Gospel would not accommodate them to their mindes, they brake with the Apostles and the Gospel it self.] I beseech you, bethink your self, doth not this signifie as much as we contend for; that *these Antichrists were not true Believers*, had not the same spirit with the Apostles, which had they had, they would not have renounced the Gospel.

But say you, [by the way, when he saith, *But they were not of us*; He doth not necessarily imply, that they never had been of them, that is, sincere, and single-hearted in the profession of the Gospel, as they were; but only that about, and at the time of their going out from them; or perhaps somewhile after, they were tainted and corrupted.] If by *going out from them* be meant, [being sent out with a commission,] as you pretended before; then is it probable, that [at the time of their going out,] they were *lesse tainted* then ever; yea, were looked upon as *lesse tainted then most others*, else had they not been [sent out with such a commission.] If by *going out* be meant *deserting* the Gospel, as we contend, then were they tainted surely *before*, and not as you would bear us in hand, [onely after somewhile,] their *tainting* being the *cause* of this their *going out.* What if the [seed be said to fall among thornes; not because there were thornes in the ground, when it was sowne, but because it fell on such a ground, where it proved to be among thornes afterwards?] Is there no difference between the *seed*, that is, the *Gospel* falling among *thornes*; and these men *falling* from the *Gospel*, and being *thornes* in the sides of it? 2. When the *seed* fell upon the *thorny ground*; I hope it fell among thornes that were rooted in the bosome of the ground, though not grown to a considerable height above the face of it. And I should think these Antichrists had sufficient *roots of bitternesse in their hearts*, when they put on the best *face* of profession. How you come to be so inwardly acquainted with them as to know the contrary, is well worth the learning. And howbeit you have the charity to think [*Demas* himself loved not the present world, when first he embraced *Pauls* company; with that affection, either for kinde, or degree, wherewith he did afterwards;] yet though for the *degree* I may yield it you, for the *kinde*, I think you will not make *affidavit* for it.

I am sure, you have not pleased to produce any argument to prove it, it is enough for your Honour, to lay your *hand upon your breast*, and gravely to say, [It is not likely;] but we may be bold, I hope, to demurre upon your words; yea, and without giving you offence say, it is *likely* that he had the same affection to the world for the [*kinde*,] though he were not so passionately transported with so high a *degree* of it, as afterwards. The lusts of the flesh, that is, after the things of the present world, we humbly conceive, are in *all men*, even while *most regenerate*; and if *Demas* had none of them in his bosome, he was too good for poor *Pauls* company, who to his dying day, was troubled *with a law in his members*, and with unruly *flesh* that *lusted against the Spirit.* It is but your kindnesse to your good friend *Demas*, to say, [It is not likely he loved the world with the same kinde of affection, that he

he did afterwards.] Sir, his love to the world, which was afterwards a *flame*, was at firſt a *ſparke* at the leaſt; and the *ſmalleſt ſparke*, and *greateſt flame*, would the yonkers of *Exter Colledge* ſay, are *ejuſdem ſpeciei*.

You conclude after your wont, [ſo that it cannot be proved from this clauſe, that the perſons ſpoken of, had never been ſincere Chriſtians; but only that they were not ſuch, when *John* ſpake theſe things concerning them.]

Yes, Sir, may I reply, it is proved hence, as you confeſs, that [they were not ſincere Chriſtians, when *John* ſpake of them.] *Ergo* it is proved they were not ſincere Chriſtians, before *John* ſpake of them: for certainly their departure from the Apoſtles, was *before he ſpake of them*, or you had need ſhew ſome extraordinary Revelation, whereby it was made known to *John*, that they whom you ſuppoſe ſincere Chriſtians *before*, did deſert the Churches Communion in that very, τῷ νῦν, that Article nick, wherein *John* ſpake, or writ thus; and that the *primum eſſe* of their Apoſtaſie, and *Johns* writing, were in one and the ſame inſtant.

But, 2. If there be not more to be proved hence, then [that they were not ſincere Chriſtians when *John* ſpake thus of them;] then *John* might as well have ſaved his words, for ſome better purpoſe. For to ſay, *they were not of us*, that is, they were no ſincere Chriſtians, now that they *had left us*; and *they left us, that it might be made manifeſt that they are not all of us*, that is, they deſerted us, that it might be manifeſt, that they are not all ſincere Chriſtians, after they have deſerted us, and that *they are not all of us*; that is, they deſerted us that it might appear, that they *are not all ſincere Chriſtians*, with a ſecret implication, that *ſome of them may be ſuch*; is to ſpeak no ſuch myſteries, as need ſo large a Comment, as your Learning hath been pleaſed to beſtow upon them.

3. It is clear that *Iohn* affirmes with an aſſeveration, *That had they been of us, they would have continued with us.* He ſaith not *had they been of us*, I hope, *while they continued*, or *ſo long*, for that were a notion of as much value as the former. But *had they been of us*, i.e. at any time of *us*, they would have *alwayes been of us*, and this he ratifies with a no doubt.

I approve your Paraphraſe upon the words, in which you ſay, [the Apoſtle gives a reaſon of his exception, telling them to whom he writes, that this was a ſigne, or argument, that thoſe Antichriſtian teachers were not of them in the ſenſe declared, *viz.* that they did not continue with them; that is, they quitted their former intimacy, and converſe with the Apoſtles, refuſed to ſteere the ſame courſe, to walk by the ſame principles any longer with them, which, ſaith he, queſtionleſſe they would not have done, had they been as ſincerely affected towards Jeſus Chriſt, and the Goſpel as we.]

But be intreated to review yout Paraphraſe, and then ſee, how well you have proved, [that it cannot be proved from this Text, that theſe Antichriſts were never true Believers; but then only about the time of their deſerting the Apoſtles Communion, or perhaps afterward.] If the Apoſtle give a reaſon of his exception againſt theſe Antichriſts, that they were not of the ſame ſpirit with him, and his brethren; then I hope, 1. There is ſome reaſon why he ſhould give ſuch a reaſon; And, 2. His reaſon for this exception, is ſuch as is above exception; but as you paraphraſe it, 1. There is no reaſon why he ſhould give a reaſon, to prove that theſe Antichriſts were not now, or about the time when they deſerted the Apoſtles of the ſame ſpirit with them, unleſſe there need be reaſon given to prove that they who run from their colours, and take up armes under the enemie; yea, deſperately charge in the Van, are not at this time, or were not juſt as they runne away, of the ſame ſpirit with thoſe who have received many a wound, and are ready to loſe their lives, rather then forſake the cauſe they have eſpouſed; or unleſſe there need be reaſon given, why a drunkard about the time he debaucheth himſelf, or a little after, when he is well liquored, and ſtammers moſt elegantly, and then ſpewes moſt fluently, and at laſt ſleeps moſt profoundly, and ſnores moſt irrefragably; is not of the ſame ſpirit with the ſober company, which he rejected, as ſo many dull, dry fellowes, to betake himſelf to the dear company of the wits. Theſe are

ſuch

ſuch aſſertions, as need reaſon, as well as this of the Apoſtles by way of *Exception.*

2. The reaſon which you pretend the Apoſtle gives for his exception, is apparently liable to exception, according to your principles: For to prove they were not of them, he produceth this as a reaſon, that *they did not continue*; but according to you, they *who were moſt of them, might not continue*; and therefore *that theſe Antichriſts did not continue*, will not prove, *that they were not of them*; [the beſt and ſincereſt (ſay you) may fall away at any time.] *Ergo that theſe men did fall away*, doth not prove, but *that they were ſome of the beſt and ſincereſt, even in the very nick before they fell away.* But let your reaſon be good, and your words which you ſubjoyne, [which queſtionleſſe they would not have done, *i. e.* not fallen away, had they been as ſincerely affected towards Jeſus Chriſt, and the Goſpel, as we,]

I demand, 1. Doth not this imply beyond queſtion, that men as ſincerely affected towards Jeſus Chriſt, and the Goſpel, as we, will not fall away?

2. Are not men ſo ſincerely affected, preſerved from falling away, by the immediate grace of God aſſiſting them, or by ſomewhat of their *own*? If you ſay by ſomewhat of their own, I need not aske who deſerves moſt thanks of *nature*; he who aſcribes *all to God*, and *nothing to our ſelves*, or he who gives *part* to our *ſelves*? and how well he in that conſults the honour of God, is as clear.

3. If men ſo ſincerely affected, be preſerved from falling away by the immediate grace of God; I aske, whether God decreed from eternity to preſerve them ſo, or no? if God did either not decree, or not decree from eternity, he doth either act without decreeing, or decrees anew; which how highly it magnifies his ſimplicity, and unchangeableneſs, I am content to referre it to Mr. *Goodwins* known impartiality in ſuch arbitrements.

4. I appeal to any man beſides one, the Reverend *Goodwin*, whom only I except againſt, as an incompetent Judge in this particular, whether Mr. *Goodwin* do not here advance the Perſeverance of the Saints, higher then his timorous adverſaries are wont to do? We ſuſpend the perſeverance of the Saints, on no leſſe then a decree of heaven from eternity, and can finde no other foundation, whereon the weight of it can ſettle, with any poſſibility of ſafeneſſe: Mr. *Goodwin* makes no queſtion of the perſeverance of men ſincerely affected to Chriſt, and the Goſpel; [queſtionleſs they would not have fallen, had they been ſo ſincerely affected as we;] only he cannot endure to hear the Saints ſhould owe their perſeverance, to *an eternal decree of God.*

This Paraphraſe of yours upon theſe words, ſufficiently ſhewes; that all you have ſaid [againſt the ſufficiency of them, to evince an impoſſibility of the falling away of true Believers,] is a true Paralogiſme; and in your concluſion to yield, the words yield more to prove the perſeverance of true Believers, then we are wont to accept from them. So handſomely have you undone *your own* buſineſſe, whiles you eſſayed to break ours.

The ſum of all you have ſaid, you make to be this, [In this aſſertion *John* plainly vindicateth himſelf, and the Chriſtian Churches of his communion, from giving any juſt occaſion of offence unto thoſe men, whereby they ſhould be induced to forſake them;] *non conſtat*, that that is his deſigne; [and reſolves their unworthy departure in this kinde, into their own carnal and corrupt hearts, which luſted after ſuch fleſhly accommodations and contentments that were not to be obtained, or enjoyed in a ſincere profeſſion of the Goſpel with the Apoſtles, and thoſe who were perfect in heart with them.] Be it ſo, and ſo we have ever carried it; but what doth hinder, but that theſe men were never perfect in heart? which is that which we plead for.

[It followes, (ſay you) ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν: *But that they might be made manifeſt that they were not all of us*; meaning, that God ſuffered them thus unworthily to break fellowſhip with us, that hereby they might all of, them one, or other of thoſe who thus cauſeleſly deſerted us, be diſcovered to be men of degenerous and ignoble ſpirits, and not principled like unto us the true Apoſtles of §. 24.

Christ, or those that walk in uprightnesse of heart with us.]

Here I observe, 1. That you forget what you had said against our exposition of the words, *They went out*; and whereas before you would have them expounded [by going out with our commission;] here you are pleased to interpret them, by [breaking fellowship with us.] For unlesse their breaking fellowship be sensed in *they went out* here to be supplied, it will not be found in any word in the Text.

2. That you are content to say, [God suffered them to break fellowship,] which implies God could *have prevented it*. I aske by what meanes? if by giving them *outward* meanes, they which went out and brake fellowship, had the *same* with those who continued fellowship? if by *inward*, then what was that *inward meanes*, I pray, but a working by power on their hearts, which you hold inconsistent with the freedome of their wills?

3. That you confesse [that God suffered them to break fellowship, that they might be discovered to be men not principled like unto the Apostles, and those which walked in uprightnesse with them;] *Ergo* I conclude, 1. That they were not principled before they brake fellowship, which is contrary to what you undertook above; And I further demand, 2. When became they to be thus ill principled, if once they were better principled? and whether they become so without Gods suffering them? if he suffered them, whether it follow not of course that he could have preserved them? and if he could have prevented them, whether he could not have prevented *others*? and if he could, whether he had not engaged himself to prevent *some of them*? and if some, upon what account he engaged himself so? whether upon any thing done by them *more then others*? and if so, whether that were done *by themselves* more then God? yea, whether it were not God that wrought in them both *to will and to do of his own good pleasure?*

I yield you, [it appertaines to the just and righteous judgement of God; and withall, is a dispensation of gracious tendency, and import, for the honour, peace, and safety of Christian Churches, and sincere Christians, that men of corrupt mindes amongst them, should be timely discovered;] and therefore conclude, 1. That these men were men of corrupt mindes before they went out, that is, were discovered. 2. That they went out, not without the providence of God, aiming at good in the suffering of their evil. 3. That all being alike evil principled at first, the difference is made meerly by the inward working of the grace of God; and that he who is [gracious in this dispensation] of suffering some to fall, [and therein aimes at the honour, peace and safety of Christian Churches,] as being able to preserve his Saints, is as gracious to keep them in the faith, wherein chiefly stands [the honour, peace and safety of Christian Churches.]

4. I desire a little parley with you, concerning the sense of these words, that *they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.*

First, Who are they who are intended here to be made manifest? questionlesse those who deserted the Communion of the Apostles; and became Antichrists.

2. Who are these *all?* you read as our translatours, *that they are not all of us*, not *that they all are not of us*, which seem to me to differ thus; They *all are not of us*, signifies *a defection of all of those that went out*; *They are not all of us*, implies that *some* among them were *not guilty* of such a defection as *the rest*. *Some* departed out of *malice*, *others* out of *weaknesse*, being drawn aside by their corrupt *misleaders*; And thus it is probable, the Apostle conceived hopes of *some* among them, who were meerly *misled*, and retained *some principles of goodnesse*, in the midst of this their unhappy *Apostasie*, which amounts to what we generally affirme, that open Apostasie *partial* may consist with *true faith in secret*; the *seed* remaine, when there is no *fruit* to be seen; yea, when the *fruit is naught*, the *good seed* may secretly abide, and in Gods good time *bring forth fruit again* in a blessed *abundance*.

And so I grant that the non-continuance of some of these false teachers with *John*, doth not necessarily, or demonstratively imply a nullity of their faith; but a nullity of the faith *of any of these* false teachers *not present*, doth *imply a nullity of it*, *even when*

When they pretended to embrace, and perhaps to *preach* the truth, which is all we contend for, *viz.* that Saints may dangerously *fall*, yet not loſe *all their faith*; that they who *deſert* the *faith*, never profeſſed it in *ſincerity*; that the Saints *ſtand* even when they *fal down moſt*, that they who *fal away* did never *truly ſtand* when they were at *beſt*.

Stella cadens non eſt ſtella, cometa fuit.

§. 25. You come now to ſhew how little credit, and countenance, 1 *John* 3. 9. gives to the Doctrine of Perſeverance, as much as it is wont to claime from it. The words are, *Whoſoever is borne of God, doth not commit ſin; for his ſeed remaineth in him, and he cannot ſin; becauſe he is borne of God.*

[The Argument levied hence, (you ſay) is this:

He that ſinneth not, neither can ſin, cannot fall away from his faith:

Whoſoever is borne of God, ſinneth not, neither can ſin: Ergo. ——

To this you anſwer by diſtinguiſhing thoſe termes: 1. *Sinneth not.* 2. *Cannot ſin.*

Firſt, By *ſinneth not*, may be meant (ſay you) either

(1.) *Sinneth not at all.* Or, (2.) *Sinneth not with delight.* Or, (3.) *Sinneth not without reluctancy.* Or, (4.) *Sinneth not unto death.* Or, (5.) *Sinneth not ſo as to make a trade of ſin.*]

[1. That it is not meant in the firſt ſenſe,] I grant you, we are too conſcious of our own, and all other Saints corruptions, to pretend *not to ſin at all*; yea, we confeſſe, not only that *in many things we offend all*, but that there is no action at all, wherein are not *too many ſins*; *If thou, Lord, ſhouldſt be extreame to marke what is done amiſſe*, in that which is beſt done by the beſt of thy ſervants, *O Lord, who ſhould ſtand? There is none that doth good* fully, and entirely, *no not one.*

2. For the reſt we are bold to diſpute it with you, that it is true the Saints do not ſin, either with delight, or without reluctancy, or unto death, [and that they do not make a trade of ſinning,] *is your own confeſſion*; and from thence we ſhall ſufficiently inferre *our concluſion*, that *they never fall away from their faith.*

1. Say you, [this ſenſe, that whoſoever is borne of God, doth not ſin with delight, cannot be juſtified, you are confident, either from Scripture, or upon any competent ground of reaſon; not to ſin, doth no where in Scripture ſignifie, not to ſin with delight.]

I anſwer, where men ſin not with *delight*, but *grief*; God is pleaſed to look upon them as *not ſinning*, and takes a *delight* to ſhew mercy to thoſe, who do *not take a delight* in their miſcarriages; and to pronounce them *guiltleſſe*, who are *grieved* for their tranſgreſſions.

You grant, [that the words *ſinneth not*, are emphaticall in the Scripture before us; but that the emphaſis lies in any ſuch modification, which ſhould give them this ſenſe, *ſinneth not with delight*; hath no good accord (ſay you) with reaſon, or truth.] I ſhall weigh your reaſon by and by; in the meane time, I acknowledge I cannot fathome your meaning, in ſaying [theſe words, *ſinneth not*, are emphatical;] if ſo, they muſt be underſtood in the *higheſt ſenſe*, and ſignifie no leſſe then *ſinneth not at all*; but this we both diſclaime, and therefore by your leave this is a ſorry emphaſis which you put on the words *ſinneth not*, [i. e. *ſinneth not* conſtantly, or ſo as to make a trade of it.] When we ſay, a man is *not poor*, meaning he hath *eſtate enough to keep him conveniently*; what emphaſis is there in it? when we ſay, a *man is not a dunce*, meaning he *hath learning enough to ſave him from being contemptible for ſottiſhneſſe*; what emphaſis is here? juſt as much as in theſe words, *Whoſoever is borne of God, ſinneth not*; that is, *ſinneth not, ſo as to do* nothing, or little elſe, in *his conſtant practice*. We pretend to no emphaſis in the words, *ſinneth not*; but profeſſe the word is to be taken in the *loweſt* and *minuteſt* ſenſe that may be, and that it is an expreſſion of *Gods ſingular love*, in not looking on the *failings of his children* according to their *merit*; not of any *tranſcendent excellency in his children*, which puts them into an *eminent condition of innocency*. Quem pœnitet peccâſſe, penè eſt innocens. And *Whoſoever is borne of God, ſinneth not*, not without a *paine*; it is only *Gods goodneſſe* that doth not account the *beſt* of them all *ſinners* with an *Emphaſis*.

2. But, 1. Why may not these words, *Whosoever is borne of God, sinneth not*, admit such [a modification] as this, *with delight?* Sure all others *delight* to sin *themselves*; yea, to draw *others* into sin; yea, account no *delight* valuable; but such as hath *sin* to render it the more *pleasant*. *Stollen waters* are much *sweeter* to *them*, though in *themselves* never so *brackish*, then those of their *own*, though never so *pleasant*. *Pro condimento est furtum*, as *Austine* said: You know on what occasion. 2. What ever you have to say to the contrary, there are none *borne of God*, who do *commit sin* with *delight*, their consciences finde all the *delights of sin*, but so many *bitter sweets*. And howbeit you proceed; [yea, the delight, or pleasure,, which they take in many sins committed by them; is the chief, if not the only reason, why they commit them. [You must give me leave to distinguish, between *delight betraying them to sin*, and *sin affecting them with delight*. I acknowledge their *delights*, ever and anon *insnare* them into *sin*; but *sin* doth not, by your leave, *furnish* them with *delight*; it may *give* them *matter of delight*, *it self* is not the *matter* of their *delight*; but men *who are not borne of God*, do too often, not onely please, but *pride* themselves in the very *sin*, and *glory* in their *shame*: As before, they preferre *puddle with sin*, before the *purest water without it*. It is not the *wealth*, but the *conzening*, (which they call *Policy*,) whereby they got it, that pleaseth them; not the *purse*, but the *sport* in *robbing*, that they esteem; not the *gain*, but the *pursuing*, is the delight of a *Nimrod*. Contrariwise they *who are borne of God*, are so farre from *taking delight* in the *sin*, that upon a sad consideration of *it*, they are *sick* of the *gain* of it, and cannot be *cured*, till they have made *restitution*. They have *no sin that they delight in*, albeit their *delight in this or that thing*, may unawares occasion their being intangled in *sin*.

When you conclude, [Yea, it is a question, whether any man commits any sin whatsoever, without delight in one kinde or other:] I know there is nothing but your sceptical wits can make a [question] of it; but I conceive, there are some [questions] which are *sinnes*, wherein no man can take *any delight*, as to *question the truth of Gods promises, to preserve him while he desires to serve God*; to *question whether God will pardon his sin, if he repents, &c.* I pray, are these [questions] no sins? or can you finde any thing, that may make these [questions] a [delight?] *Est quædam flere voluptas*, for that *Egeritur lachrymis, ejicitúrque dolor*. But how to tosse such doubts, should be a [delight?] and to question whether a man can be other then miserable, should be a *pleasure?* I shall be glad to learne from your incomparable subtilty. *Da*, Quintiliane, *colorem*. I think it may be rather determined, that *no man sins without some secret grudgings of grief*; and it must needs be so, upon the ground which you lay next, that unregenerate men sinne not without some reluctancy, which is one of the reasons you give against the next sense of the words.

§. 26. [By *sinneth not* say others, is meant sinneth not deliberately, or without inward reluctation in the act of sinning:] Against this you object, and demand, what necessity is there for this? Why may not *John* as well mean sinneth not unto death, or customarily?] Well, let him mean so too; yet why may he not mean also, *sinneth not without reluctancy?* These meanings, (learned Sir,) are not adversaries, nor so quarrelsome, that one house cannot hold them; let them all make up the meaning of the Apostle, and what is the ill consequence? 2. You affirme that [*Certain it is, that he that is borne of God*, doth at least sometimes commit sin with deliberation, and in the Apostles phrase, makes provisions for the flesh, *i.e.* plots and projects meanes, and opportunities for the committing of it, and digests it as it were into method before-hand; witnesse *David* in the matter of *Bathsheba*, and *Uriah*; the two Patriarchs, *Simeon*, and *Levi*, in the matter of the *Schechemites*, *&c.*]

1. I deny not but these examples are too pregnant proofes of holy mens sinning with deliberation, but do not come up to prove that [*they sin without reluctancy.*]

But, 2. I affirme, that even these Saints did not *deliberate how to sin*, under the formality of *sin*, as wicked men are wont to do; they plotted against *men*, they did not *immediately* against *God*, as do wicked men. They did not say, *Let us cast how*

how to break his bands asunder; and cast his cords from us; Yea, *David* upon the mentioning of God, soon betook himself to *repentance*, and with sorrow and shame condemned *himself*.

But [3. Say you, neither is it true, that every one that is *borne of God*, sinneth alwayes, when he doth sin with inward reluctancy. Doubtlesse *David* was not divided in himself, in the committing of the sins lately intimated, considering he continued according to the generall opinion of our best Protestant Divines, for about the space of a whole year after the committing of those sins, without any remorse for them. And if the Lord had not sent the Prophet *Nathan* unto him, to awaken him, who knowes, but that he might have slept in those sins unto death?]

I answer, That reluctancy may be either *in* the act, or *after* it, against the *repeating* and *justifying* it; and *such reluctancy* was here found in *David*.

1. In that he did not commit adultery with *Bethsheba* a second time; but let her depart to her house, without staying her, or recalling her for a further satisfying of his lust.

2. In that he did acknowledge the sin, upon her sending word to him that she was with childe; he might have said, How appears it, it was by *me*, and not by thy *husband*, or some *other man*, with whom (for ought I know,) thou mightest commit follie, as well as with *me*? Thou who would'st be drawn so easily, to commit lewdnesse with *me*, who, for ought thou couldst know, did but *trie* thee, to *punish* thee for thy wickednesse, would'st be as forward to do it with any one of my *Nobles*. She that will be a whore to her *Prince*, will not stick to play as foule with a *Subject*.

3. In that he was content to marry her, of a *whore* to make her a *Queen*; too high an honour for her, as great a dishonour to him.

4. In that he was content to marry her while she *was with childe*.

5. In that he *staid* till after the *dayes of her mourning*. How would some others, either have disdained to make her such amends, as to have owned her; or else have been so hot upon it, as to have done it sooner, and to have gone to her *bed*, ere her husband were laid in his grave? These carriages shew, that if there were no reluctancy *in the act*; yet there was *after it*; and onwards, whereas too many others would have reviled the Prophet, that should have presumed to reprove them, and have held the Prophet as guilty in *rebuking*, as themselves were in *committing* the offence, stood upon their *prerogative*, and maintained the act to have been not liable to an *account*. *David* no sooner was *charged*, but he confesseth himself *guilty*, owns the *judgement* of God, and craves *mercy*.

It is true, that [if the Lord had not sent the Prophet to awaken him, we know not how long he would have slept in his sin;] but we know, that God having made a Covenant with *David*, *in all things sure and faithful*, *would* not, *could* not be wanting to him, in meanes, whereby to *awaken him*, that he slept not in death. Besides, say you, [As concerning sins *quotidiani incursus*, or sins of infirmity, which are common to those who are borne of God, with others; the case is yet more evident, *viz.* that these, at least many of them, are committed by them, without any such inward reluctancy, and particularly those of which they have no knowledge or sense when they commit them.]

I grant you, they commit many sins, whereof [they have no knowledge when they commit them,] but it is seldome, but they have *afterwards*: And no sooner do they discover them, but that they shew their grief for them, and detestation of them; nor could these be called sins of *infirmity*, but that they happen against the *bent and inclination* of their *spirits*, which is sensible of their weaknesse, and watcheth over it with an holy and humble jealousie.

But, [4. And lastly (say you) Suppose it were granted, that men *born of God* do not sin, but with inward reluctancy; yet that this is not the sense, wherein the Apostle ascribes non-sinning unto them, appeares hence, *viz.* because certain it is, that the non-sinning, ascribed to men *borne of God*, is such, which is appropriate

unto them, and not communicable to wicked and unregenerate men, but that men unregenerate ſin, and that frequently, with inward reluctancy, is the frequent acknowledgement of theſe men themſelves; and is beſides of eaſie deduction, from *Rom.* 1. 32. *Rom.* 2. 1, 5. nor is it, nor can it reaſonably be denied by our adverſaries themſelves.]

I anſwer, 1. It is not denied by your adverſaries, that [wicked men ſinne not alwayes, without inward reluctancy;] but we deny they have *ſuch* a reluctancy as the Saints; the *Wicked*, it may be, diſcerne the *unworthineſſe* of the ſin, as againſt their *honour*, *profit*, other *ſecular intereſts*; but ſeldome take into their thoughts the *diſpleaſingneſſe of it to God*; or if ſo they ſin with a reluctancy, it is made by their *fear of God*, not their *love* of him, as do the Saints. The *unregenerate hate God* at all times for *love of their ſins*, the *Saints hate their ſins* out of *love to God*: the *Wicked* know the judgement of God to be *againſt ſuch as commit ſuch things*, and yet both *do them*, and *delight in thoſe that do them*. In your Text, *Rom.* 1 32. The *Saints* albeit they know they ſhall *not come into condemnation*, and have the *pardon of their ſins*; yet *grieve* ſtill for the ſins, which either *themſelves* or *others* commit againſt ſo *gracious a God*, with *whom there is mercy, that he may be feared*. The *Wicked* condemne *themſelves*, yea, and *others*; and yet fear not *Gods condemning of them*, for thoſe ſins. In your Text, *Rom.* 2.1. The *Saints condemne themſelves*, for thoſe ſins, after they are aſſured *God hath forgiven them*. The *unregenerate deſpiſe the riches of Gods goodneſſe*, and *after their hard and impenitent heart, treaſure up unto themſelves wrath againſt the day of wrath*. The *Saints* deplore their own *poverty* and *inability* to anſwer the *riches of Gods goodneſſe to them*, and are ready to *emptie themſelves* of all they are, for the honour of God. Shortly, the *unregenerate* have no reluctancy againſt *ſin*, but in order to *themſelves*; the *regenerate* have a reluctancy againſt ſin in order to *God*, and his *goodneſſe*; and out of the ſweet apprehenſion of it, are ready to account any thing *loſſe*, that they may *gain Chriſt*.

What if it be [the frequent acknowledgement of wicked men themſelves, that they ſin with reluctancy?] it is not *ſuch a reluctancy* as this of the *Saints*. It is only *Reaſon* at beſt, that works ſome pangs, and touches of reluctancy in thoſe, *Grace* operates in another way in *theſe*; a reluctancy againſt ſin, becauſe it *diſhonours* their heavenly *Father*, *diſcredits* their holy *profeſſion*, is as a *thorne* in the ſide of *Chriſt*; nor can they *pierce him*, but they *wound themſelves*, and would *die* of the *griefe*, did not God *heal them* with the *anointing of his Spirit*, the only balſome that can either *cure*, or *eaſe* them. This ſhewes that there is *Spirit within them*, luſting againſt the *fleſh*, which in every ſin doth *reagere ad reſiſtentiam*, though it do not *ad victoriam*, yet makes them *ſin the leſſe*, when they *do it moſt*. Shortly, in *unregenerate men*, when there is moſt *actual reluctancy*, there is a *virtual tendency* to *compleat ſin*; in the *Saints* when there is moſt *actual compliance* with a ſin, there is a *virtual contrariety* againſt it. The Saints when now the temptation is over, need no *new principle* to make them *returne* to their *former holy courſes*, and that with *ſorrow* and *ſhame* for their unhappy deviations. The *unregenerate* I hope, need a whole *new heart* and *ſpirit* to be created in them, or elſe the beſt of their *carnal minde* is but *enmity againſt the Law of God*, and *is not ſubject to it*, *nor indeed can be*, Rom. 8.

In a word, *unregenerate men*, when they do *good*, are *over-borne*, and have an *inward* wicked *reluctancy* againſt it: The *Saints* when they do *evil*, have an *inward* holy *reluctancy againſt it*; *The good which I would, that I do not, and the evil which I would not*, (ſaith Saint *Paul*) *that I do*. And, *It is not I, but ſin that dwelleth in me*, Rom. 7. Till the *luſts* have found a trick, to lull *Reaſon* aſleep, they cannot prevaile with the *Saints* to commit ſin. They imploy the *Reaſon* in wicked men, as a forward inſtrument, which is ambitious to ſerve them, and never refuſeth the commands of any *one luſt*; but in reference to ſome *other*, to which it hath *more devoted* it ſelf, in hope of ſome *greater advantage by it*.

§. 27. You oppoſe your ſelf againſt a fourth interpretation of *not committing ſin*, that is, *unto death or final impenitency*. An Expoſition (as you confeſſe) [if it could be made

made to ſtand upright, able to bear the weight of the controverſie depending alone; but you tell us, 1. That you meet with no reaſon at *all* from the aſſertors of this Expoſition, for the confirmation of it.] Peace, Sir, the words of the Text, *For his ſeed remaineth in him*, have a ſufficient reaſon in them, Surely if the man *who is born of God*, ſhould *commit a ſin unto death*, and yet *his ſeed remaine in him*; this *ſeed remaining in him.* he ſhould *die*: and ſo this *ſeed* might be found, at leaſt for a while, in him after his *final impenitency*. The Reaſon that a regenerate man cannot ſin unto death is clear from hence, that elſe the *ſeed* ſhould *not remaine*, contrary to the expreſſe words of the Apoſtle. But of this more anon, in the mean time, conſider we what you ſay. 2. [That there are three Reaſons at hand againſt this interpretation, beſides thoſe which are in coming.

Say you, 1. The Grammar, or letter of the phraſe, breatheth not the leaſt aire of ſuch a ſenſe]; that is but breath, ſay we, the words, *his ſeed remaineth*, blow ſtrong to this purpoſe.

[2. The phraſe of *committing ſin*, is nowhere in Scripture found, in ſuch a ſenſe; you mean to ſin with final impenitency, or unto death,] be it ſo taken *abſolutely*; but if it ſignifie *leſſe* here, then to *ſin with final impenitency*, ſtanding in *conjunction* with theſe words, *for his ſeed remaineth in him*, it will ſignifie *nothing*: For if it ſignifie, as you ſay afterwards, [a ſinning cuſtomarily; and that he who is borne of God, cannot ſin cuſtomarily, becauſe his ſeed remaineth in him,] then much more muſt it ſignifie *ſinning to death*; for the ſeed may better remain with a [*cuſtome of ſinning*] on *earth*, then with a *ſinning to death*, which of courſe carries a man to *hell*. And further, there muſt be a [*cuſtome of ſinning*,] before a man can be hardened to an *impenitency in ſinning*; this being the *effect* of a *cuſtome*, and *trade of ſin*. Impoſſible it is that a childe of God ſhould *ſimul & ſemel* grow ſo *hard* from that *tenderneſſe* which was wrought in him by the Spirit of Grace.

[3. The context doth not invite, much leſſe inforce ſuch a conſtruction; The intent of the Apoſtle from *verſe* the third, even to the end of the Chapter, being not to ſhew or argue, whether the ſons of God may poſſibly in time ſo degenerate, as to live ſinfully, and die impenitently; but to evince this, that thoſe who claime the great honour, and priviledge of being the children of God, cannot juſtifie, or make good this claime to others, or themſelves, but by an holy and Chriſtian life, and converſation. Now it is one thing, to argue, or prove, who are the ſons of God at preſent; another, whether they who are the ſons of God at preſent, muſt of neceſſity alwayes ſo continue.] Right, But by your leave, you are to go higher then the third *verſe*, and you ſhall finde,

1. In the firſt *verſe*, that the Apoſtle ſheweth the love of God in making his Saints his Children *at preſent*.

2. In the ſecond, that he proceeds to ſhew, what he will make them *hereafter*.

And, 3. Then in the third *verſe*, he ſhewes how their *expectation of what he will make them in heaven*, workes upon them to *make themſelves on earth*, viz. *pure, as he is pure*, contrary to what you are uſually pleaſed to dictate. Indeed he takes off that objection which you, and your conſciencious confederates are wont to make, *That a certainty of ſalvation opens a gap to all licentiouſneſſe, and looſeneſſe*; no, ſaith the Apoſtle, *He who hath this hope, purifies himſelf, even as God is pure*. And in the fourth *verſe* he ſheweth, that whoever they be, that allow themſelves in a way of wickedneſſe, are none of the children of God. *Whoever committeth ſin, tranſgreſſeth alſo the Law*; ſo farre is he from being a Beleever of the Goſpel; which whoſoever *embrace* in ſincerity, know what it was for them to be under the *Law*, and its *curſe*; and *who* it was that *bare the curſe of the Law for them*, and ſuffered ſo great a meaſure for *their ſins*, albeit he had not the *leaſt ſin* of *his own* chargeable upon him. And upon this account none of them can preſume to indulge any the leaſt liberty of ſinning to *themſelves*. Now whereas the Saints might be apt to trouble themſelves with a too ſad thought of their frequent failings, and breakings of the Law; he addes for their comfort, *verſ.* 7. *Let no man deceive you; he who*

doth

doth righteouſneſſe, is righteous, as he is righteous; that is, he who endeavours to live righteouſly, albeit he have many failings in his *own beſt righteouſneſſe*; yet hath *all* happily covered by the *righteouſneſſe of Chriſt*, and is in Gods account *righteous, as he is righteous*, i.e. to *juſtification*. *And* as for *ſanctification*, he is graciouſly preſerved from *committing ſin*, as the children of the Devil do; that is, (as you would have phraſed it more elegantly,) to ſuch a rate of iniquity, and danger; but he *cannot ſin, becauſe he is borne of God*. Where by your leave he doth not only ſhew, [that they who claime the great honour of being Gods children, cannot make good this claime, but by an holy and Chriſtian life;] but that a holy, and Chriſtian life, is the effect of their being Gods children; *they cannot ſin, becauſe* (ὅτι) *their ſeed remaines in them*.

He aimes at this, to *confirme their comfort*, and to eſtabliſh that ſweet Doctrine which he delivered in the ſecond *ver*. *We know that when he ſhall appear, we ſhall be like him: for we ſhall ſee him as he is*. As many corruptions and infirmities as we have within, which makes us groane; as many temptations as we have without, which would make us ſuſpect our ſelves, though not conſcious of ſo many infirmities within; that thoſe enemies would be too ſtrong, albeit we had no Traytor to joyne with them; the Apoſtle ſaith, *We know that we ſhall be like him, and ſee him*. And how ſo, but from hence, that *now we are his children*; and he who *made* us his own *children*, will *keep* us from being Satans *ſlaves*, and ever imploy the ſame power in *preſerving* us, that he did at firſt, in *bringing* us unto this bleſſed *Sonſhip*? And thus *Reſpondent ultima primis*, all hanſomely hangs together. By your leave, the Apoſtles deſigne is to ſhew, *That they who are the ſons of God at preſent, ſhall alwayes continue ſo. We know that when he ſhall appear, we ſhall be like him, for we ſhall ſee him as he is*. Thus then the context carries that in it, which makes for this Expoſition, as confidently as you brave it down. Good Sir, put on your Spectacles once more, and take in the two firſt *verſes*,, and begin not your Analyſis of the Chapter onely at the third *ver*. This we ſhall expect from you, when you publiſh your large and queſtionleſſe as learned Commentary on this Epiſtle. You proceed.

§. 28. [If by *ſinneth not*, the Argument meaneth, walketh not ordinarily, or cuſtomarily, in any known courſe of ſin; the propoſition is granted, as to this clauſe, that *Whoſoever is borne of God ſinneth not.*] And ſay I, that is enough to prove he *ſinneth not to final impenitency*, and *ſo to death*. No man falling from the *fear* of God, yea, and *love of him*, and endeavour in all things to pleaſe him, to ſuch a wretched eſtate of *obduration* againſt him, but by many ſenſible degrees. *Nemo repente fuit turpiſſimus*,

2. You proceed to the other terme, *Cannot ſin*, and tell us, [that theſe words *can* and *cannot*, are very ambiguous; and that in Scripture-phraſe,

Firſt, a man may be ſaid to *can*, or to *be able to do a thing* when it is *meet*; and when it is *uncomely*, it may be ſaid he *cannot* do it, *Gen.* 39. 9.

Secondly, a man may be ſaid to *can*, or to be *able to do a thing*, when having ſufficient *ſtrength*, he is under *a preſent diſpoſition of minde*, or *will* to do it; and ſo when he *wants ſuch a diſpoſition*, it may be ſaid of him he *cannot* do it, *Mark* 6. 5.

Thirdly, it may be ſaid he *cannot*, or is not *able* to do a thing, when it is *difficult*, though not altogether *impoſſible* to be performed, *Matth.* 19. 11.

Fourthly, it may be ſaid he *cannot*, when there is only a *preſent incapacity*, though no *impoſſibility* of doing it; and for this purpoſe you quote *Amos* 7. 10. *Matth.* 5. 14. &c.

Fifthly, the word *cannot*, imports an abſolute *impotency*.] Well, take the glory of this rare *Philological* diſcourſe, without any blemiſh for me. Let us trie whether the *Logicall* application of it be ſuitable; and what wonderful *earnings* you will make of theſe admirable Criticiſmes. Why, you tell us, that [if the clauſe *cannot ſin* in the Argument propounded be underſtood.

§. 29. According to any of the foure firſt ſignifications of the word *cannot*; *both* the propoſitions are falſe, if according to the fifth and laſt, the *major* is true, but the *minor* is falſe.] I need not ſee, whether this will all hold water; Let it paſſe for what con-

concernes the *major*: for we do not lay the weight of the Argument, (as your learning cannot but too well know) upon either of these foure senses of *cannot*; you shall have the honour to have shewed your selfe as valiant, as *Don Quixot*, in your noble encounter of these formidable Windmills; which none but such a brave Knight and doubty man at armes, as you, would have been perswaded to draw upon

The story of Richardo *and of* Bindo,
Come forth like Nilus *peeping out at Window:*
And put the wandring Jew in much amazement,
To see so great a voice without the casement.

Let us see what matter of *Romanso's* you will make by your high and mighty exploits upon the *minor*.

[Again secondly, according to all these significations, and importances of the clause, *cannot sin*, in the said Syllogisme the other Proposition also is false, which saith, that *Whosoever is borne of God, sinneth not, neither can sin.* §. 30.

For, 1. He that is borne of God, may very possibly do that which is uncomely, and unmeet for him to do.] Right valiantly still, you knock us down ere we stand up against you.

[2. He may be able to do that, by the supervening, or contracting of another habit upon him, which by reason of a contrary habit, prevailing upon him for a time, he cannot do;] you gallantly throw us off still, ere we come neer you.

[3. He may possibly do that, which is only hard or difficult for him to do;] as clear as the Sun still; nor do you finde it any insuperable difficulty, to prove that which is not *altogether impossible* to be *some way possible*.

[4. And lastly, he may have a remote capacity in him of doing that in the future, and in time, and consequently may do it, which at present he is under an inability to do;] irrefragable still, as I may [in the *future*, and in *time*,] finde some weight in this discourse of yours, which [at present] I am [under such an inability to do,] that I can hitherto see nothing, but what is as light as a feather; and therefore you conclude beyond all possibility of a rationall reply, that hitherto this *minor* now under *canvasse* is false, as some body was wont to swear most reverently, *by my Deanery, false*.

[If the said Argument understands the phrase, *cannot sin*, according to the fifth and last import of the word, *cannot*, wherein it sounds an utter *incapacity* or *impossibility*; though in this sense the *major* proposition be granted, *viz.* that he that doth not sin, nor can sin, cannot fall away from the faith; yet the *minor* is tardy, which saith (as we lately heard.) *Whosoever is borne of God, sinneth not, neither can sin:* for *he that is borne of God*, is in no such incapacity of *sinning*; of sinning I mean in the sense formerly asserted to the Scripture in hand, which amounts to an absolute impossibility for him so to sin.] True, if you take him of *himself*, but false if you consider him as supported by the *Spirit of God*. Well, but [because this seemes to be the sense intended in the Argument, and the *minor* proposition in this sense to be built upon the Scripture in hand; let us consider whether the reason which the Scripture assignes for the said assertion, *Whosoever is borne of God, cannot sin*, doth necessarily inforce such a sense thereof.] Agreed; for this purpose you §. 31.

[1. Tell us of two *assertions*, one, that *he who is borne of God, doth not*; the other, that *he cannot sin*, and two *reasons* respectively given; of the *first*, for *his seed remaines in him*; of the *second*, for *he is borne of God*.

2. You disable this reason from the word μένει, that it doth not respect any future permanency of the seed.

3. You answer two objections against it;] I shall briefly examine all.

First, I yield you your two assertions are rightly *distinguished* by you, but not so rightly *sensed*, *as you* would have them. For though it be *true* what you alledge, yet is it *short*; [*Whosoever is borne of God, doth not make a trade of sin.*] say *you*; Ergo, say I, neither *doth he sin with final impenitence, or unto death.* [*He cannot*

make a trade of ſin,] ſay *you*, Ergo, ſay I, *neither can he ſin With final impenitence, or unto death.* I wonder why you ſhould yield, [*he doth not, cannot ſin ſo, as to trade in it*;] yet ſay, [he may *ſin* with finall *impenitence*;] he muſt of neceſſity make a [*trade*] ere he come to this [*final impenitence*;] and if your meaning be, *he cannot make a trade of ſinning, While he continues the childe of God*; but may *ceaſe* to be the childe of God, and then make a *trade of ſinning:* I pray, when doth he *ceaſe* to be the *childe of God*? none but a [*trade of ſinning*] can put him out of this *relation* to God; and yet forſooth he muſt be *out of this relation* before he come *to ſet up this trade*; for he cannot be a *childe of God, and a trader in ſin at once*, as your ſelf confeſſe. Now be pleaſed to ſhew your ſubtilty, and tell me which is the *primum non eſſe* of his being a childe of God, and which the *primum eſſe* of his trading in ſin? Tell me, (as I know you are excellent at theſe *quiddities*,) whether there be any *quies* of this *mobile in puncto reflectionis*? when a childe of God turnes from that relation to be an *Apprentice*, whether it be when he begins the trade, or how long after he hath *ſerved duram ſervitutem*, or when he comes to be a *Freeman* of the Company? I long to hear how accurately you will bolt this; in the mean time though we expect very *fine flower* from you; hitherto you bid us content our ſelves with *courſe branne*; but I live upon hopes, that I ſhall have dainty new nothings from you one day, when your more important affaires will permit you this buſie leaſure; in the mean time vouchſafe to accept this poor conſideration preſented to you with all lowlineſſe, from your very humble ſervant; that the Apoſtle intending here, (as I have ſhewed,) to *comfort the children of God*, and to ſtrengthen them in their ſweet expectation of *happineſſe in heaven*, upon this ground, that *they are the children of God*, ſhould ſpeak at a very low rate: If he ſhould ſay no more to the purpoſe then this which you ſay, *viz.* [that while they are the children of God, they cannot trade in ſin, [but *may be turned off* to that ſordid imployment upon every humour of their free will, and ſo *ceaſe to be the children of God*, and ſuddenly loſe all their ſo dearly purchaſed *priviledge* and inheritance.

I come now to examine your Reaſon for this your venerable aſſertion.

Say you, [The reaſon ſaith the Apoſtle, why ſuch a perſon commits not ſin in the ſenſe explained, is, becauſe his *ſeed*, the ſeed of God, *by*, or *of* which he is *borne of him*, ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, *remaineth in him*; *i.e.* (according to the frequent ſignification of the word μένειν, to *abide* or *remain*, in the Writings of the Apoſtle,) *is* or *hath* an *actuall being* or reſidence in him; and that in this place it doth not ſignifie any perpetual remaining, or abiding, no nor any abiding with reference to the future, is evident; becauſe the abiding of the ſeed here ſpoken of, is given as the reaſon, why *He that is borne of God doth not commit ſin*; i. e. doth not at preſent walk in any courſe of known ſin. Now nothing in reſpect of any future permanence, or continuance of being, can be looked upon as a cauſe of any preſent effect; but onely in reſpect of the preſent being, or reſidence of it.]

Here you moſt ſubtilly give us a reaſon, 1. Why μένειν, ſignifies the *preſent* being. 2. Why it cannot ſignifie the *permanence or future abiding* of the ſeed, and ſo upon the whole, why your ſenſe of the place is to be admitted as the maine; but under correction, Firſt, you do not conſider that according to your gloſſe, you muſt either yield that the *childe of God muſt ſin*, if he ſin at all in the ſenſe explained, *while this ſeed is in him* de præſenti; or you muſt take the paines to indoctrinate us *When this ſeed is loſt*, and *when the childe of God ceaſeth to be ſo*, whether upon his *firſt entrance* of the borders of the [*trade*] of ſin, or after ſome conſiderable *progreſſe* made in it; and then, I pray ſet up your *land-markes*, that we may diſcerne the *maximum quod ſic*, and the *minimum quod non* in this caſe. You ſhall receive many high applauſes, if you ſhall pleaſe to ſtoop to this acceptable Work.

2. Nor do you take into your thoughts that this, *doth not ſin*, ſignifies not only the *preſent*, but that which is *paſt*, and that which is to *come*; and ſo takes in *all tenſes*; the preſent tenſe doth not ſignifie ſuch a τὸ νῦν, as to exclude time either *paſt*, or *future*; when I ſay, *homo eſt animal*, this *eſt* I hope is as much as *erat & erit*, *God is true*, this *is*, is as much as *is*, *was*, and *is to come*, the verb of the *preſent tenſe* in this

in this case includes *all* tenses; unlesse when you say, *homo est animal*, or *Deus est verax*, you may be supposed to consignifie foorsooth, that *homo* may in *some other article of time* not be *animal*, or *Deus* not be *verax*; and it is the same case for our *doth not*. *God tempteth no man*, it is *said* in the *present*, I hope it is to be *sensed* in *all tenses*: And thus, *He that is borne of God doth not sin*, is as much as he *did not sin thus*, since *he was borne of God*, & *shall not sin* as *long as he is borne of God*. Now good Sir, adde,

3. That *is borne of God*, is indeed in the *preterperfect tense*, γεγεννημένος; he that *hath been born of God*, *doth not*, *cannot sin*; he who *hath been* once borne of God, *doth not*, *cannot* ever sin in the sense of the Apostle. Now then unlesse you can make, that *he who hath been borne of God*, *may cease to have been borne of God*, which is *impossible*: you must be content to acknowledge, that I may lay more stresse upon this *participle of the preter tense*, then you can on the *verb of the present*. Thus then for your first part, we see you have not plaid it so well, but that this μένει, though it signifie the *present tense*, yet it signifies *more*; all you have alledged against it hitherto notwithstanding. I come to trie how well you behave your self in your next part, [that it doth not signifie the future abiding, or permanence;] the reason you assigne is, [because nothing in respect of any future permanence, or continuance of being, can be looked upon as a cause of any present effect, but only in respect of the present being, or residence of it.] True; but that which *is*, and *will be* also *continually*, may very well be looked upon as *so much the greater cause of a present effect*, for the *certainty* of its *inherence*, so as to *continue* for *the future*, is an *argument* of the *more* efficaciousnes of it in its *present operation*, as that *heat*, which is so in the *fire* as to continue still in it, is of course more intense, then that heat in a *stove*, which will by and by be lost, and accordingly *doth not*, *cannot* operate so vigorously; the measure of the *operation* is answerable to the measure of the *radication* of a quality. Now that quality which is *so strongly radicated*, as *never to be lost*; may hence be rationally concluded, to *work more signally*, then that which hath but such a loose and faint inhesion, as that it will *vanish soon after*. And thus the being of the *seed in him that is borne of God*, so as *to remaine in him for ever*, is a clearer reason for the potent working of it *at present*, then could have been assigned, had it been said to be but *so* in him that is *borne of God* at the *present*, as that it may *cease* to be in him for the *future*.

I yield, [the reason why the Soul moves, and acts the Body to *day*, is not because it will move, or act it to morrow,] as you most acutely ratiocinate; or [because it is in the body to day, upon such termes, as that it will be in it to morrow also;] but I trow the reason why the soul acts, and moves the body to day, *strongly* and *livelily*, is because it hath *such a being in it to day*, as it will not be fain to quit it *to morrow*. A man who shall *die to morrow*, will finde his soul move his body, more *feebly to day*, then he *who* will *live* 40. *years more*; yea though a man be *to die to morrow*, of but an *unnatural* death; yet if he know it, his soul will remit somewhat of its alacrity in moving his body *to day*; and thus a man had he the *seed in him*, but upon such termes *to day*, as that it should not be in him *to morrow*, would questionlesse act but *languidly*, and *dully*. But what for all the world do you mean by saying so gravely, [much lesse because the soul is an immortal substance, or the like; but because it is now or this day, in the body.] I think indeed that the *immortality* of the soul is no *cause*, why it moves the body; but the immortality of it is a cause why it moves the body more *strenuously*, then *mortal* soules do, as that a *man's* soule moves his body more than *beasts* can do, that is, in more *artificial* wayes; the *immortality* of a mans soule *formally* considered, is not I grant the cause of it, but the immortality *radically* considered, is; that is, the *spiritualnesse* of the soul, and *independence* of the soul upon the body, in regard of *many operations* which makes the greater *dependence* of the *body* upon the *soul*.

You go on to the same tune, [So the reason why the Angels at this day do the will of God, is not because they have such a principle of holinesse, which they cannot put off, or lose to eternity; but because they have such a principle, as we speak of, residing in them at the present.] But I had thought that [because the

Angels have such a principle of holinesse to day, as cannot be lost to eternity;] therefore their principle of holinesse acts them in a more *eminent* way of *obedience* to the will of God, then that *weaker* principle in *men*, which you say [may be lost;] and we confesse may be unhappily *abated*, though it be *recruted* againe. Still *modus operandi sequitur modum essendi*; and therefore you are too forward to conclude, [that when *John* here assignes the *remaining of the seed* of God in him that is borne of him; certain it is, that by this *remaining of the seed*, he meanes nothing else but the present residence, or abode thereof in this person; And if his intent had been either to assert or imply a perpetual residence of this seed *in him that is born of God*, it had been much more proper for him to have reserved it for a reason of the *latter* proposition, *viz.* *Why he that is borne of God cannot sin*, then to subjoyne it as a reason of the *former*. For though the future continuance of a thing in being, can be no reason of a present effect; yet it may be well a ground, or reason of the continuance of a present effect.] Very good; and say I, this *doth not sin*, signifies the *continuance* as well as the *present condition* of *not sinning* in this sense: And this *cannot sin* had been weakly confirmed by *he is borne*, that is, *hath been borne of God*, γεγεννημένος, unlesse the being *borne*, *having been borne* of God, carried in it enough whence to conclude a *perpetuall continuance in being the childe of God.*

Albeit [a future continuance of the cause, be not a reason for the present effect;] yet the being of the cause at *present*, *such* as to *continue*, argues the *strength* and *force* of its *operation at present*, more then the being of it, such as would *not continue*, can do. An *unquenchable fire* burnes, more fervently, then that which may be *extinguished* within a few minutes. You proceed,

§. 32. [Now that the word μένειν, to *remain*, or *abide*, frequently signifieth, especially in the Writings of this Apostle, onely a present residence, or being; whether of a person, or thing, without any reference unto, or implication of a future, appears by many instances, 1. *But you know him*, saith our Saviour to his Disciples, speaking of the *Spirit*, ὅτι παρ' ὑμῖν μένει, i.e. *Because he remaineth or abideth, with you, and shall be in you.* Here the latter clause, *and shall be in you*, will be found a meere Tautologie; if the other phrase *abiding with them*, imports a perpetuall residence, or in-being.]

I answer, the *last* clause, by your leave, imports somewhat more then the *first*, but it is not in the word, *shall be*, opposed to *remaineth*; but in those, *in you*, *shall be in you*, opposed to those; *with you*, *remaineth with you.* In the remaining of the Spirit *with them*, he might seeme to say no more, then that the Spirit should assist them by such meanes, as you are wont to speak of, *exhortations*, and the like, which he might do, though only in *others*, whom he should qualifie, to give such *exhortations*, and the like. But now he addes that the Spirit shall *be in them themselves, inwardly teaching*, and framing their hearts. And thus your first instance comes short. Your second goes little further.

[In the same Chapter, *vers.* 25. (say you) where the Originall hath it, παρ' ὑμῖν μένων, i. e. *remaining* or *abiding with you*: Our *English* Translatours render it *being yet present with you.*] Very good; the words are, *I have spoken these things unto you*, παρ' ὑμῖν μένων, which are opposed to *his being now ready to depart*; and so it is clear, that παρ' ὑμῖν μένων, signifies a *continuance with them* for a *considerable time after* the speaking of those words; and so somewhat *future*, and not onely what was *present.* And truly it seemes a strange speech, for Christ to tell them, else *he spake to them being present with them*; if this *being present* signified only *being present so long as he spake*; but it imports no lesse then *being present with you so long since*, that you had *time* enough to have *consulted me* concerning the meaning of my *speech.*

[Your third instance is, where this Apostle saith, 1 *John* 3. 14. *That he that loveth not his brother*, μένει ἐν θανάτῳ, *abideth in death.* The meaning is, (say you) that such a man is in an estate of death, or condemnation; not that he *will*, much lesse *must* of necessity abide for any space of time *after*, least of all for *ever* in that estate: for then it would follow, that whoever at any time did not love his brother, never after became a childe of God.] This is somewhat better then the other

others, yet wide enough from the marke. For I hope; *he that loveth not his brother*, not onely *is*, but *shall be* in death, so long as he *shall not love his brother*. No hopes of *life*, whiles he still continues out of *love*. If you tell me, that so it is true, that *Whosoever is borne of God, sinneth not*; that is, shall not sin, while he continues borne of God; and that *so long* the *seed remaines in him*: but that this infers not, but he may *cease to be borne of God*, and the seed depart out of him, just as he *who loves not his brother* at *present*, may love his brother *hereafter*, and so cease to abide in death.

I reply, that the case is extreamly different; For in the case of the *non-lover of his brother*, the *abiding in death* is a *consequent*; and the *non-loving* being taken off, farewell his *abiding in death*. Now this *non-loving* may be taken off, and often is, by the blessed work of the Spirit of grace; but in the case of *the childe of God not sinning, for his seed remaineth in him*; the *remaining of his seed in him*, is the *cause* of his *non-sinning*; and this cannot be taken off, but onely by *sinning*. You will confesse therefore, as long as this *cause* of *non-sinning*, the *seed remaines*, there can be *no sinning* in that sense; and thus as it is an [insupportable saying, that a man cannot be changed from not loving his brother, to love him, and so translated from the state of death to life;] so is it a *supporting* saying, that a *childe of God cannot lose his seed*, and so *cannot sin at* such a rate as the Apostle meaneth.

Your Criticisme wherewith you conclude this Paragraph, borrowed by you from Mr. *Leigh*, and by him from *Cameron*, and *Grotius*, that it is familiar with *John* to use the word μένειν, which properly signifies to remain; for the *verb substantive, to be*, signifies little in this businesse. For wherever *this seed is*, there it is sure to *remaine*; and you may observe the Apostle concludes, that *a childe of God cannot sin*, from what is *past*; for that he is, γεγεννημένος, *i. e.* one that *hath been borne of God*; *once borne of God*, and *ever borne up against* the *Devil*; be *once*, and be *ever* the *childe of God*.

[But besides, that in the place in hand, μένει, must only signifie a present abode, or being, not a future, or perpetual, is (you say) evident from hence; because such a signification of it would render a sense altogether inconsistent with the plaine scope of the Apostle in the context; which is to exhort Christians unto righteousnesse, and love of the Brethren. Now it is contrary to all reason, yea, to common sense it self, to signifie unto those whom we would perswade to any duty, any such thing which imports an absolute certainty, and necessity of their doing it, whether they take any care, or use any meanes for the performing of it, or no. And a clear case it is, that the certainty of a perpetuall remaining of the seed of God in those that are borne of him, imports a like certainty of their perpetual performance of the duties whereunto they are exhorted.] Here you are in at your old game; but by your leave, do not play faire, in saying,

[1. That there is any certainty, or necessity of their doing it; whether they take care, and use any meanes for the doing of it or no;] the *seed of God remaining in his children*, doth not *remove the use of meanes* appointed by God, it *puts* them upon a *careful using* of them.

[2. That the certainty of a perpetual remaining of the seed of God in them, imports a like certainty of their perpetual performance of the duties;] it imports at most but a certainty of their *non-performance* of the contrary, not of their [perpetual performance of the duties.] Besides, duties are not *ad semper*, to be *always performed*, though *semper* to be *never opposed*.

[3. And lastly, you proceed to answer several objections against your interpretation.

First, If it be said, (say you) Yea, but the seed of those, which are borne of God, or begotten, is said to be an immortal, or incorruptible seed; and therefore cannot perish, or decay in those who are begotten of it, or in whom it ever takes place: You answer,

1. That this *seed*, is expressely said *to be the Word of God*;] and then shew learnedly, that [the Word of God is not said to be immortall, or incorruptible; be-

cauſe it cannot be loſt, by thoſe who once receive it, but in ſundry other reſpects.] But why ſhould you ſo confidently affirme that [this *ſeed* is expreſſely ſaid to be the Word of God?] When as,

(1.) The Apoſtle diſtinguiſheth expreſſely, between the *Word of God*, and *this ſeed*, ἀναγεγεννημένοι, οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς, ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, *begotten again, not of corruptible ſeed, but incorruptible by the Word of God*; of ſeed, by the Word; the *Word*, and *Seed*, diſtinguiſhed in this work.

(2.) You your ſelf in your next Paragraph, [1. Tell us, that it may be ſome queſtion; whether by the *ſeed of God*, be meant preciſely the *Word of God*; and not rather that which the Scripture calls the *Divine nature*, and is the effect of the Word. And, 2. Imply, that you conceive, this is that which is here meant;] and truly I think you are right in it, that this is meant in the place before us. Now how the *Divine nature*, as the Apoſtle calls [that heavenly impreſſion,] as you ſpeak, ſhould be *laſt*, is not like to be ſhewed by you in haſte. And what you ſay.

§. 34. Of its [ſpiritfulneſſe, vigour, and activeneſſe, and potent excluſiveneſſe of ſin,] makes (I ſhould think) againſt you; eſpecially what you ſay in the cloſe of it, [That the reaſon why the ſeed of God remaining in a man, is ſo potently excluſive of ſin, in the ſame ſubject with it, is the Abſolute holineſſe, or moſt perfect hatred of ſin, which is in God himſelf, of whom the Perſon is begotten again by ſuch his ſeed.

As the Reaſon why a Lion hath courage, ſtrength, and other like leonine properties, is, becauſe he came of a Lion, a creature naturally endued with the ſame properties.] All this, though I cannot finde in my ſelf any inclination to thank you for it, yet ſtill makes for us againſt you; for if [the children of God, derive ſuch abſolute holineſſe, and moſt perfect hatred of ſinne from God; (a thing which none of his ſons on earth dare adventure to own;) and that as a young Lion, [derives courage, ſtrength, and other leonine properties from the old Lion, from whom he came;] There is no more likelihood of their degenerating into wicked men, then there is of a *Lions* becoming a *Calfe*.

But, good Sir, conſider a little better, 1. That the *Lion* hath not theſe [leonine properties, becauſe he comes from a *Lion*;] ſo doth perhaps a *Flea* come from a *Lion*, as well as a *Dog*; but becauſe he comes from a Lion in a way of *natural generation*. Now what is this to Gods begetting us to a ſpiritual life?

2. That the Lion hath not [theſe leonine properties,] becauſe deſcended from a Lion in a way of *natural generation*; but becauſe he hath the *nature* of a Lion, or the *forme* of a Lion. This is the *immediate*, and *intrinſecall*, the other but a *mediate*, and *extrinſecall* cauſe: And ſo the *Divine nature in the perſons begotten*, is the *formall cauſe* of their *holineſſe*; the *Divine nature* in *God*, is but the *efficient* cauſe of it. Or, if you will, the holineſſe is part of the *Divine nature in them*, of which they are ſaid to be made *partakers* only in reſpect of *knowledge, holineſſe*, and *righteouſneſſe*. But you ſpake truer then you are aware, when you ſaid, that [the reaſon why the ſeed of God remaining in a man, is ſo potently excluſive of ſin, is the abſolute holineſſe, or moſt perfect hatred of ſin, which is in God himſelf.]

Sir, it is the abſolute holineſſe of God, and his moſt perfect hatred of ſin, which cannot poſſibly admit a breach of any of his promiſes, whereunto we attribute all the *incorruptibleneſſe of the ſeed in his children*; it is to *be preſerving* them according to his engagement, that we aſcribe it. Your *Simile* of a *Lion* is no better then a tale of a *Cock* and a *Bull*, as bravely (as you crow, and roare it out.

§. 35. [Secondly, ſay you, there is onely one objection more, as farre as you are able to apprehend, which lieth with any ſeemingneſſe of ſtrength againſt the premiſſes. The tenor hereof is this: If the ſeed of God remaining in the Regenerate, worketh in him the greateſt, and ſtrongeſt antipathy againſt ſin, that can likely be imagined,

which hath been granted all along in the traverſe of the Scripture in hand; how is it poſſible, that ſuch a man ſhould fall away, eſpecially totally, and finally from his faith? It is no wayes reaſonable, to ſuppoſe that it is poſſible for a man to fall away thus from his faith without ſinning; no, nor without ſinning very grievouſly; nor is it much more reaſonable to ſuppoſe that a man may ſin, and that grievouſly, who hath the ſtrongeſt and greateſt antipathy againſt ſin that can lightly be conceived: therefore how is it poſſible for him who cannot ſin, even in this ſenſe to fall away totally, or finally. You anſwer?]

But before I come to your *anſwer*, I ſhall be bold to tell you that *you alone object* after this manner, as well as afterwards you *anſwer*. It would be long enough ere we ſhould ſuſpend the *impoſſibility of the falling away of the Regenerate*, meerly upon their [Antipathy againſt ſin,] without the *aſſiſtance* of Gods *Spirit* to preſerve them in this *Antipathy*, and the *engagement* of Gods *truth* to continue this *aſſiſtance* of his *Spirit*. We indeed alledge the *remaining of Gods ſeed in them*, but we attribute the *remaining of this ſeed* onely to the *ſupporting of Gods hand*; without which the *ſeed* would be not onely *barren*, but *loſt*. *We* ſay, we are to look *without our ſelves* for our preſervation, not to any thing *within our ſelves*, even of *Gods working*, as a ſufficient cauſe to keep us from falling. The *greateſt ſeed* without the *continual influence of Gods Spirit*, would ſoon *die* in the *quickeſt ground*; ſoon be *choaked* with *thornes* and *briars*, which when they are beſt *rooted out*, yet ſecretly *lurke*, and would ſuddenly *ſprout* forth in the *beſt ſoile*.

I come now to conſider your anſwer, with this preface of honour, that your anſwer, when it hath done its part moſt againſt us, will deſerve very well of us in this buſineſſe; and help to ſhew how the Saints may *retain* [an Antipathy againſt ſin,] even when they are moſt unhappily *overcome by it*; and ſo *remaine precious Saints*, even while they are overtaken with the *groſſeſt ſins*, as will appear anon in your large Anſwer, wherein you ſay,

[1. That he that hath the ſtrongeſt Antipathy againſt ſin, that fleſh and blood is capable of; yet retaines that eſſential character, or propertie of a creatures mutability, which ſuppoſeth a poſſibility at leaſt of ſinning, if not *ſenſu compoſito*, while ſuch an Antipathy remaines; yea, its full vigour, and ſtrength; yet *ſenſu diviſo*, in caſe, or when this Antipathy ſhall abate and decline.] Right, but this [*mutability* being a character, and property of a creature,] not onely the [ſtrongeſt Antipathy againſt ſin, which fleſh and blood is capable of;] but the ſtrongeſt alſo, which the *Angels* (who I truſt are all creatures) are capable of, is ſubject to it, and ſo *they* too are ſubject to ſinning, in a *poſſibility* of it at leaſt. Well, the Saints on *earth* have little reaſon to be agrieved, when the *Angels in heaven* are brought by your Doctrine into a *poſſibility of ſinning*, becauſe of their *mutability*. We think their *mutability of nature* notwithſtanding, they are as to this particular *immutable* by *grace*; and that this *poſſibility* of their ſinning, by reaſon of their *creature-like mutability*, doth not prejudice their *impoſſibility of ſinning*, by reaſon of their *Creatours immutability* over-ruling their own *mutability*.

Well, but you have a care, to qualifie this *poſſibility of ſinning*, with a [*ſenſu diviſo*] for the preſent, albeit anon you ſhew it too, *ſenſu compoſito*; but for the preſent your illuſtration ſeemes not to be too Philoſophical. [As though water (ſay you) made hot, to the higheſt degree of heat, whereof the nature of it is capable, cannot poſſibly coole any thing, while it remaines under ſuch a degree of heat; yet it may loſe its heat, and then coole;] yea, by your favour, and ſo may it too while it retaines its heat: put but a *live coale* into *boiling water*, and you ſhall ſee the experiment, and finde that the ſame water, which is *hot* enough to ſcald your *hand*, hath in it that which is ſufficient to *quench the fire*. And thus indeed have thoſe good men who have the greateſt *antipathy againſt ſin*, enough in them to *quench grace*, were it not prevented by *Gods own hand*. Even where the *fleſh* is moſt eminently *ſubdued*; it is *ſtrong* enough to beat down all the works of the *Spirit*, did not the *Spirit* ſtand ready to *repaire* what is *decaying*, to *confirme* what is *repaired*.

With-

Without *his assistance*, alas, how soon would the *greatest Saint* be shamefully foiled by the *least temptation*? It is not any *gift* in *facto esse*, but the Spirits *giving* and *keeping*, which are still in *fieri*, that alone can secure the *best men* from the *worst falls*. Good Sir, we do not know any one of our brethren that talkes of such an *antipathy against sin in the Saints*, as must needs alwayes continue potent, and effectual in the *same degree*; we are all sensible of waxings, and wanings of our *graces*; ebbings, and flowings of our *corruptions*; but albeit we yield and lament such *variations in our selves*; we rejoyce to mantain an *unchangeablenesse in God*; and are easily able to make it good, that *his hand*, though it be not alwayes alike *stretcht out*; yet is never *shortened*; *his power* is that whereon we lay the *strength* of our dispute, for the *perseverance of the Saints*; and *that*, we are sure, admits no *abatements*; his *power* in conjunction with his *faithfulnesse* to imploy it, for their *perseverance*, and that is above all *allayes*, or *diminutions*. We grant the Saints Antipathy against sin may *abate*, we deny that *Christs compassion to the Saints may*; and as long as he cannot forget how he was once *compassed with infirmity*, he will never faile to use all his interest in *heaven*, for the necessary succour of his Saints on *earth*. If he suffer now and then their graces to *decay*, yet at least that *decay* proves an happy *increase*; and after they have been made *sensible* of their own *infirmities*, they are made the more blessed *partakers* of his *strength*, which ever gloried to be made *perfect in weaknesse*. You are much too nimble, when you conclude, [If it, *viz.* this Antipathy against sin may fall one degree, why not another? and if two, why not all, considering that all, and every degree hereof is but of one and the same nature?] We are in this to consider, not the *nature of the Saints graces*, but the *truth* of *Gods promises*. We confesse, were the Saints left to their *own freewill*, they *might* fall; yea, soon *would*, first from *one* degree of their Antipathy against sin, after from *another*, and at last from an *antipathy against sin* to an *antipathy against holinesse*. The more *grace* they have had, the more would *nature* pride it self in its vanities, and glory to shew how its *corruptions* could revenge themselves upon *grace*, but God is pleased to *engage himself to preserve so much grace*, as shall be *sufficient for them*; and to shew them by the *abatings of their graces* now and then, that they *owe* them *all entirely* to his *free bounty*. In his *wisdome* he suffers *some degrees* of their *graces* to faile in *some cases*; in his *truth* he cannot suffer *all to be lost*; yea, in his *goodnesse* he makes the *losse of one degree*, for *a while*, to be the *gaine* of *many degrees* to continue for *ever*.

But say you,

§. 36. [If it be here said; Yea, but such a strong Antipathy aginst sin, as you suppose and grant in Regenerate men, is inconsistent with any such abatement, or declining, and cannot reasonably be looked upon as capable of such a falling, or losing; so much as of one degree of its strength, inasmuch as such a losse cannot be without sin; and till there be such a declining, the person is supposed to be full of the hatred of sin; therefore unlesse he shall be supposed capable of sinning, even in *sensu composito*, whiles he is yet under the most perfect hatred of sin, he must be supposed uncapable of any declining at all, in such his principle; and consequently much more of falling away, either totally, or finally.

You answer,

1. That, according to your adversaries, faith in men Regenerate, or the grace of Regeneration it self, to whatsoever degree raised, may very possibly decay, or decline; though not totally, or in all the parts, or degrees of it; yet in some, yea, many; yea, so farre, that it may seem utterly, and totally lost: And if so; then possibly the Antipathy, or hatred against sin, may lose ground also.] Very true, but therefore you adde,

[2. When you suppose, or grant a strong Antipathy against sin, in those *that are borne of God*, you do not suppose this Antipathy to be unimpairable, or that it can be impaired without sin in him.] What of all this? why, you proceed to shew that [notwithstanding the greatest Antipathy against sin, a Saint is subject to temptations, incogitances, forgetfulnesse, and other humane frailties; as *Solomon*

in

in the height of his wisdome, was capable of doing foolishly, and weakly.] And yet I think he was no *fool*; but that *his wisdome remained with him.*

And so for a good man *borne of God*, he may be drawn [by temptation, incogitancy, forgetfulnesse, and other humane frailties,] to do that which is *evil*, and yet his *goodnesse remaine with him*; this is all for our advantage. And hence we clearly inferre, that you cannot inferre with any *reason*, as much *confidence* as you are wont to shew, that the Saints *lose their graces* when they *fall into sins*, though of a *fearful nature*: The *secret antipathy against sin* may remain, when they do most *openly comply with it*; and the *seed of God* continue in their *hearts*, when their *hands* are most full of the *fruit of sin.*

The *principle* may be in their *heart*, and yet not produce *actions* congruous unto it, as your self confesse here in general; and I apply to the particular in hand. Who hath gotten by this now? you earne as little by what you adde,

[2. Of the mindes being uncapable of intending plurality of objects, actions, or occasions at once.

3. Of the minde, or will of a man, not being necessitated by any habit, inclination, or disposition whatsoever, always, or indeed at any time to intend them or their motions, or actings.] From hence you inferre forsooth, [that an Antipathy, and that strong against sin, may consist with sin.] And true it is; but say I, therefore you have no reason to conclude a *losse of grace from a sin*, though it be *hainous*; and so no denying the *continuance* of it, notwithstanding the sins of the Saints; but as long as *grace continues*, I hope they are not out of the *favour of God*; and as long as not out of the favour of God, they are in a *condition of salvation*; albeit I grant they shall not be brought *actually to heaven*, till *repentance*; but he who *continues his favour*, is I hope able to continue their *lives*, till *they repent*; and surely it argues little favour *not to continue them till they repent*, this being so *easie* for *him*, and so *necessary* for *them*. What you subjoyne,

[4. That when the Scripture supposeth, or asserteth a moral impotency in men, either wholly to cease from their long accustomed actions, or to act contrary unto them; it asserts no absolute impotency in them, in respect of either,] is nothing more to your advantage. For whereas you conclude, [Therefore it is no *dura suppositio*, to suppose, that a person invested with the strongest antipathy against sin, whereof he is capable, may notwithstanding even in *sensu composito*, viz. this antipathy standing, either do that which is sinful, or omit, or neglect the doing of that which is his duty, and of great concernment likewise unto him to do.]

I reply, that therefore when a Saint doth either omit a duty, or commit a sinne; his antipathy against sin may notwithstanding remaine; and if his antipathy against sin, then of course the *grace of God*, from whence alone comes this *antipathy*. And thus you have unawares done our work to our hands, and been at the cost of all these lines, for the unwilling promoting of our cause, which you so industriously endeavour to bear down.

But all the while you have done nothing to purpose towards the answering of the objection, which you proposed against your self, for that you have not shewed which *is first*; an *abating of this antipathy*, or an *attainting* with *sin*, which is the *knot* you were to *untie*, but leave it as it was, after all this your tedious fumbling about it.

And now howbeit [you suppose you have clearly acquitted that Scripture, 1 *John* 3. 9. more vehemently suspected and charged, then any of its fellowes, with confederacy against that Doctrine, which affirmes a possibility of a totall and finall defection in the Saints;] You have right learnedly shewed, that *the Saints may fall to a defection*, and yet *continue their antipathy against sin*; which is as much I hope as *grace*, which is the common Doctrine of your contemptible Adversaries.

Sic vos non vobis,——

[Another Scripture, (say you) hath the same imputation cast upon it, for §. 37.

ſpeaking onely thus, *My Father which gave them me, is greater then all, and no man is able to take them out of my Fathers hand*, John 10.29. From hence it is argued, that God engageth himſelf with his Omnipotency to preſerve the Saints, or Sheep of Chriſt, from either totall or final apoſtaſy; and conſequently, that it is impoſſible, but that they ſhould be preſerved. But to this place, ſufficient anſwer hath been given already in this Chapter, Sect. 18, 19, 20, &c. where we ſhewed, that the engagement of the mighty power of God, for the ſafeguarding of the Saints, as ſuch, or remaining ſuch, is frequently aſſerted in Scripture; but no where for the compelling or neceſſitating of them to perſevere or continue ſuch.] Thus you hope you have already taken out of our hand this Text, wherein it is aſſerted, *that none can take us out of Gods hand*; but let the Reader but pleaſe to have recourſe to my examination of the place you referre him to, and he will finde we keep our own, as much as you pull, and draw till you ſweat again; and we are like to hold it ſtill, for all your tugging afreſh here upon the place; Where you adde,

[That by the Tenor of the Context it appeares, 1. That that ſecurity for which our Saviour engageth the greatneſſe of his Fathers power unto his Sheep, is promiſed, or aſcertained unto them; not in order to the effecting of their final perſeverance, but rather by way of reward to it. 2. That this promiſe of eternall ſafety made by Chriſt unto his Sheep, doth not relate to their eſtate in the preſent world, but to that of the world to come.]

Prove *this*, and take *all*; but take this along with you in the mean time; that if this be all which Chriſt intended to aſſure his Sheep, *That when they came to heaven, they ſhould be ſecure there*; he muſt ſuppoſe his *ſheep* very *ſilly*, that needed to have *any aſſurance* for this.

Albeit it puzzle *us Chriſtians*, to think how the Angels fell from heaven; yet it is readily acknowledged by *all* that acknowledge a *heaven*, that *men* who are *once there*, are ſafe there for *ever*; and that heaven is too *high* for any enemy to *reach them*, if once they get thither. The Scripture *often aſſerts the glorious eternity* of the happineſſe of thoſe in *heaven*, to draw mens *hearts and converſations thither*, it *never proves* this eternity, as taking it for *granted without proofe*; and that Chriſt ſhould ſo ſolemnly *confirme* that which *no ſheep* did ever *queſtion*, is not credible to any that conſiders at what rate (as your phraſe is) his wiſdome was wont to ſpeak. It is not agreeable to it, ſo gravely to *demonſtrate* that which no man ever doubted of. Chriſt had matters of *too great importance* to communicate to his *ſheep*, to miſſpend his words in unneceſſary things; and ſure it was not neceſſary to indoctrinate *any* but meere *veales* in this moſt evident particular. His thoughts are too *ſhallow*, that dreames Chriſts ſpeech hath no greater *depth* in it.

Well, let us hear how profoundly you diſpute for this ſuperficial ſenſe; [*My ſheep*, ſaith he, *Verſ.* 27. *hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me.* In which expreſſions of *hearing his voice*, and *following him*, he intimates, or includes their perſeverance, as appeares by the words immediately following: *and I give unto them eternal life.* This gift of his preſuppoſeth the final perſeverance of thoſe to whom it is given.]

I anſwer, 1. That *all following of Chriſt*, is farre from *coming* up to *perſeverance*. What think you, did not many of *Chriſts followers* retire themſelves to their *old Lords*, and not onely *forſake* Chriſt, but *oppoſe* him? If ſo, it followes clearly, that *following* doth not neceſſarily ſignifie *continuing to follow him.*

2. That *eternall life* is (according to you,) given to *many who did not follow Chriſt all their lives long.* I pray remember the conſtruction you were pleaſed to put on *John* 17. 13. where you eſſayed to ſhew, that *eternall life* ſignifies no more then the *meanes of eternall life*, or the *word of eternall life*, Chap. 4. Now this *word* was given to *Judas*, and ſome other like perſeverers. And ſo accordingly *eternall life* in your ſenſe, which is a very *dead one*; as *dead*, as we ſay, *as a door-naile.*

3. That Chriſt in ſaying, *He gives eternall life unto his ſheep that follow him*; if by *eternal life* be meant, as indeed it is, *eternal happineſſe in heaven*, ſhewes indeed that

theſe

theſe followers to whom he gives eternal life, do perſevere; but I pray *by whoſe help? he gives them eternal life*, ſaith the *Text*; therefore ſay *I*, he gives them *perſeverance in following him till they come to eternal life*; or if you will, he gives them ſuch life of *grace* on *earth*, as continues for ever, till it be *ſwallowed up into the life of glory in heaven*. But becauſe *his ſheep* being conſcious to themſelves of their *own* unhappy *inclination* to ſtragling, and wandring, and *Satans* unwearied *diligence* to *ſeduce* them, and his *inſtruments* buſie *endeavours* to *enſnare* them, by worldly temptations, fitted ſometimes to *one affection*, ſometimes *to another*, muſt hereupon be apt to fear what would become of them *hereafter*, as ſincerely devoted as they knew themſelves to be to Chriſt for the *preſent*; he ſweetly aſſures them both of *his own* and *his Fathers* reſolution to engage their *almighty power* for their *preſervation* in *faith and obedience*, whereby they ſhould *follow him till* they came to *eternal life*; and this, in theſe words, *And they ſhall never pluck them out of my hand; my Father which gave them me, is greater then I, and none is able to pluck them out of my Fathers hand.* As who ſhould ſay, *If you ſuſpect my power*, as inſufficient to *preſerve you to eternall life*, which will not *reſcue my ſelf from temporal death*; if you doubt of the ſufficiency of *my* power to *ſave you from ſpiritual enemies*, which will not *deliver me from bodily ones*; if you be at a ſtand whether *my power* will be enough to *ſave you from hell*, which will not *keep my ſelf from the grave*; whether *my power*, which gives way to weak *men* to naile *my hands* to a *Croſſe* on *earth*, will be able to inveſt *your heads* with a *Crown* in *heaven*; yet have you no colour of exception againſt the confeſt Omnipotency of *my Father*, and he and I are one; therefore what *I will, he will*; and his *power* ſhall be imployed as well as *mine*, for *your bleſſed preſervation to life eternal*. Were they once in *Abrahams boſome*, they were out of danger of *Satans boſome*, to ſweep them out; but that which Chriſt aſſures his ſheep, is, *preſervation on earth to heaven*; not of *preſervation in heaven* from *falling to hell*.

They ſhall never periſh, neither ſhall any pluck them out of my hand: Spit in your hand, and hold as faſt as you will, or can, you muſt be faine at laſt to quit your ſenſe of the words, as being minute, dull, dry, and having nothing in it worthy of Mr. *Goodwin*, much leſſe of the greater Maſter. But we will have the patience to hear you make as much as you can of your new Gloſſe; [it followes, *And they ſhall never periſh, neither ſhall any pluck them out of my hand.*

In theſe words he ſeemes further to explaine, how, and in what ſenſe he calls that *life eternal*, which he promiſeth to conferre upon them; as, *viz.* that by the *eternalneſſe* of it, he doth not onely mean ſuch a conſtitution of it, which ſecureth it from periſhing, or diſſolving, in reſpect, or by meanes of any *intrinſecal* cauſe; but which likewiſe ſecureth it againſt all *external* powers, which may ſeem to threaten, or indanger it.] Belike the *ſheep* were ſo *fearful*, they thought they might meet with *dogs in heaven*, that would be ready enough to *choak them*; or that the *gulf* between *heaven* and *hell* was not ſuch, but that the *devouring Lion* could break through; and that the *gates of hell* might riſe ſo high as to break downe the *towers of heaven*; and that they ſhould not be out of *gunſhot*, though in the *Cœlum Empyreum*, nor ſecure enough from the *powers of hell*, though they had all the *hoſtes of heaven* quartered round about them. Either you make the *ſheep* extreame *weak*, or their *ſhepherd* not over-*wiſe*; if this *be all* is intended in theſe words, that *none ſhould pluck them down, after they had gotten up to heaven*. But queſtionleſs the *fear of the ſheep*, was onely of *dangers on earth*, and againſt *thoſe* doth Chriſt endeavour here ſo ſeaſonably and ſweetly to ſecure them.

Now you proceed, [And for a further confirmation, that the life which he promiſeth unto his ſheep hearing his voice, and following him, *viz.* as was ſaid, perſeveringly, is eternall in the beſt, largeſt, and moſt comprehenſive, and moſt deſirable ſenſe of the word, he ſubjoynes the words in hand, *ver.* 29. *My Father which gave them me, is greater*, viz. in power, *then all, and none is able to pluck them out of my Fathers hand*; as if he ſhould have ſaid, God himſelf, by whoſe grace they became my *ſheep*, and *followed* me; and whoſe power is abundantly ſufficient for the work, would maintaine and make good unto them to the uttermoſt, that

life which I ſhall give unto them, againſt all *dangers*, all enemies, all adverſarie powers whatſoever.]

Be it ſo, *Ergo*, 1. I conclude here is mention made of *Gods will*, [would maintain, &c.] as well as his *power*. Now then take theſe words, as you ſay, [we muſt in the moſt large, comprehenſive, and deſirable ſenſe.] I hope it was much more [deſirable.] that God would preſerve theſe ſheep *to heaven*, as well as *in it*, (which is our ſenſe) then that he would preſerve them only *in it*, but not *to it*, which is yours, and ſo accordingly *our ſenſe is* to be preferred.

2. I conclude that God *can keep the ſheep unto heaven*, as well as *in it*; for whatever you object to the contrary, makes the caſe of theſe ſheep the more ſad; and conſequently this our ſenſe of the words, the more *comfortable*, and [*deſirable*;] but [they are to be expounded, (ſay you) thus to the greateſt advantage of ſolace to the poor ſheep.]

3. I conclude that Chriſt promiſing to give them *eternall life*, as you ſay, [in the moſt deſirable ſenſe;] he muſt promiſe them *eternal life*, as ſoon as may *be deſired* by them; but to have *eternal life* to them on *earth*, is more [deſirable] then to have it *only in heaven*; therefore Chriſt promiſeth, *that even on earth* they ſhould have *ſuch life* in them, as *is eternal*; that is, *ſuch life*, as being *begun in this world*, ſhould be *continued world without end*.

And thus we have ſeen here more then [aire or breath,] as you word it, a ſtrong *gale* of the Spirit, for an engagement of the great power of God to bring about the perſeverance of the Saints upon ſuch termes as we contend for.

§. 38. You come to [another Scripture, much intreated (as you ſay) in the behalf of the Doctrine of Perſeverance, that of the Evangeliſt *Iohn*, concerning our Saviour: *Having loved his own, he loved them unto the end*, John 13. 1.

Out of this light, (ſay you) ſome draw this darkneſſe; Therefore whom Chriſt loves once, he loves alwayes, or unto the end; which inference they ſuppoſe is further ſtrengthened by that of *Malachy*, chap. 3. 6. *I am the LORD, I change not.*]

Sir, Theſe Scriptures need not [be intreated,] they readily give in a precious teſtimony to the ſweet truth of this dear Doctrine, and ſhine with moſt comfortable rayes on thoſe poor ſoules, which ſit even in *darkneſſe*, and *can ſee no light*; but in *Chriſts love to the end*, and *his Fathers unchangeableneſſe to all eternity*. That with *him there is no ſhadow of turning*, is that which alone ſupports our drooping ſpirits, when we *walk many* times, as in *the vale of the ſhadow of Death*.

I ſhall proceed to conſider the anſwer you are pleaſed to put in to our declaration from theſe Texts.

[First, (ſay you) from the paſſage in *Iohn* there can nothing more be concluded in reference to the queſtion in hand, by way of immediate deduction, then the greatneſſe and conſtancy of Chriſts love to ſuch of his Diſciples who continued in their obedience, and faithfulneſſe unto him. For the Evangeliſt, I ſuppoſe, did not intend *Iudas* among thoſe whom Chriſt loved unto the end.] But did all the Diſciples beſides *Iudas* continue in their obedience, and faithfulneſſe unto him? What, I beſeech your Reverence, is your judgement of *Peter*, when *he denied Chriſt*? did he continue in his obedience, and faithfulneſſe? What is your apprehenſion concerning the reſt who *forſook* their Maſter? belike you have the charity to conceive they did it out of pure [obedience and faithfulneſſe.]

I ſee your liberality hath a minde to gratifie your needy adverſaries, with a conceſſion, that ſuch ſins as *deſerting*, *and denying Chriſt*, may conſiſt with [*faithfulneſſe*;] that is more then *we* are wont to declare, who ſpeak onely of *faith*. But why ſhould you be ſo harſh to your own Doctrine the while, as to ſay, [you ſuppoſe the Evangeliſt did not intend *Iudas* amongſt thoſe whom Chriſt loved unto the end?] Surely, if he died for *Iudas*, he loved *Iudas*; and if he died *equally* for *Iudas*, as much as for the reſt of his Diſciples, he loved *Iudas* as much as either of them. Let this paſſe, for your immediate deduction, ſay you,

[Secondly, no more can be concluded by way of proportion, or rational conſe-

quence

quence from this Deduction, then that the love of Christ is great, and constant to all those who persevere in love, and faithfulnesse unto him;] as for instance, the Disciples did at this time, witnesse *Peters forswearing* him, and the others *forsaking* him.

[But for the passage it self, if it hath any aspect upon the present dispute, it is rather by way of favour to that side against which, then that for which it is commonly alledged; for if the love of Christ to his Disciples unto the end, necessarily supposeth, or requireth the concurrent continuance of the same affection in them towards him, then it plainly followes, if *men shall draw back from him, his soul will have no further pleasure or delight in them.*]

You put me in minde, of what a grave Alderman *said once* to his wise brethren on the Bench: If *Henry the eight* were *before Henry the seventh*, the Law is of *our side*; if otherwise, we are like to have a *troublesome businesse*: So, [if the love of Christ necessarily supposeth a concurrent continuance of the Disciples affection to him,] clearly *you* must carrie it; if otherwise, *we* shall be in a considerable capacity of making good our part out of this Text, against all the evidences that will be produced by our great *Gamaliel* against us. Now may your Rabbiship vouchsafe to give us leave, to put the trial upon this issue; we will say nothing to the prejudice of *Peter*, or any of his brethren, but shall in all humility yield the cause upon your reading your *affidavits* for [the concurrent continuance of their affections unto Christ;] especially of the [same affections in them towards him, which were in him towards them.] We know not what variety of businesses of greater, and more publick concernment your learning is at present encumbred with, and therefore will take no advantage of your delay; but be content, you should make this good at your Worships own pleasure, and better leasure. Onely we shall desire that without offence we may put in our exception against what you say of the [expresse Doctrine of the man of God, who was sent to meet King *Asa* and the people with him, upon the late presence of God with them against their enemies: *O* Asa, *and all* Judah, *and* Benjamin, *hear ye me. The Lord is with you, while you be with him; and if ye forsake him, he will forsake you.*]

For you will pardon us, if we see not, 1. How this concernes the Disciples, and Christs love to them, [suspended upon the concurrent continuance of the same affections in them towards him.]

No nor, 2. How this concernes the dispute in hand; for this we humbly conceive is spoken of *outward* deliverance, not of *inward*; of *temporal*, not *spiritual* things.

No nor, 3. How if God should forsake men, in respect of his love, upon their forsaking him in respect of their obedience, and faithfulnesse, any that have *once forsaken him*, (as we acknowledge the best Saints do, now and then, more or lesse.) should *ever returne to him*; We conceive *they returne not till God drawes them*; and if *he* draw *them* back to *him*, when *they* draw back from *him*, we suppose they have reason to confesse, God is *better affected towards them*, then *they are towards him.* And therefore as roundly as you inferre that [this Text clearly supposeth,

First, a possibility of their forsaking God, who for a time are truly and really with him.

And secondly, a certainty of Gods forsaking those that forsake him;] We are still in the dark, as to this: But,

Yield, 1. That there is [a possibility of their forsaking God; who for a time, and truly are with him,] in respect of *outward profession*; we deny that this concernes those that are with him in *inward sincerity*; the others are *truly with him*, but not *true with him.*

We yield, 2. That they who are true with him in respect of inward sincerity, may *forsake him for a time* in respect of *outward profession*; *Peter* and the rest of the disciples are not yet out of our thoughts. We deny that there is *a certainty of Gods forsaking those*, that only *them forsake him for a time*; the said *Peter* and his Brethren,

the Damſel and the Cock, ſeem to be ſtill in our eares. God may *forſake them*, in reſpect of *ſenſible comfort*; ſo we think Chriſt himſelf complained, that his Father had *forſaken him*; yet *not forſake them* in reſpect of *ſecret favour*; ſhould he *forſake them till they of themſelves return to him*, wo is them, that forſaken *once*, and forſaken *ever*. And if there be a certainty *of Gods forſaking men, every time they forſake him*, alas, *what fleſh can be ſaved*? If [the continuance of Chriſts love to us, depend on the concurrent continuance of the ſame affection in us to him,] his love is ſuch as we muſt be very uncertain, how long it will hold, when it is moſt ſtrong; and as certain, it will not, cannot be recovered, being once loſt; And in the mean *time*, we *owe our ſelves chiefly for all we owe to his love*, which is meerly [ſuſpended on *our own*.]

§. 39. [2. Say you, It is not here ſaid, that *Chriſt having loved his own, loved them unto the end* of *their lives*, or dayes, but of *his own*, viz. of *his life* and abode in the world. The Emphaticall, and clear meaning of the place being thus, that to declare the marvellous greatneſſe, and conſtancy of his love to his Diſciples, and that whiles they were yet in the world, and ſo ſubject to many weakneſſes, and infirmities, which might ſeem to render them leſſe lovely unto him, then thoſe that *were made perfect* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) *through death*; He did not ceaſe to manifeſt his care and love towards them, no not at ſuch a time, or ſeaſon, wherein the moſt affectionate, and tender parents are wont to forget, or lay aſide the thoughts of their deareſt children, as, *viz.* when he knew, and was very ſenſible of a moſt hideous, and grievous ſtorme of death, now ready to fall upon him.]

I am not unwilling to yield you, that *the end* is not amiſſe interpreted by you; but I hope I may ſafely inferre, that if *Chriſt loved them to the end of his abode in the world*, then to the end of *theirs alſo*. For I hope he did not change, or abate his love to them; after he went *out of the world to heaven*, ſince he *went thither to prepare a place for them*, to *intercede for them*, to *ſend his Spirit the Comforter to them*: who *ſhould lead them into all truth*, and *teach them many things*; which while Chriſt was with them, in reſpect of his bodily preſence, *they were not able to bear*; *after* Chriſt left them they were more *amiable* and *lovely* then *before*, by reaſon of a more *plentiful infuſion of the precious graces of the holy Spirit*. And can you think, Chriſt, if he loved them to the [*end of his life on earth*,] when they were worſe, did love them *leſſe* after his coming *to heaven*, when now they were better, and had coſt him dearer? if he would ever have abated his love, it would have been then, when he was *denied by one, deſerted by others, neglected by moſt of them*, and he *himſelf* yet *compaſſed about with infirmities*. But he whoſe love to them was ſo ſtrong, even *then*, did not abate of *his love after he had increaſed theirs*. So that let this be granted you, that Chriſt loved them to the end, in the letter of the Text, only [*of his own abode with them*;] it will inferre, that he loved them to the end of *their abode on earth alſo*, they being more unworthy of his love *before*, and walking more anſwerably to it *after* his death,

2. What mean you by ſaying that, [This is to ſhew, Chriſt did not ceaſe to manifeſt his love to them, when he was neere death?] whoever doubted, trow you, but that Chriſt manifeſted his love *moſt eſpecially*, and as you ſay [emphatically] in his death? By the way,

3. What is this rare notion of [Parents forgetting their children neere the time of their death?] Sure, many Parents, who ſeldome remembred their children all the time of their life, are yet mindful of them at the approach of death, and then ſolicitouſly bethink themſelves of dividing all their eſtate among them, as little pittances as they allowed them *before*; ſo that theſe are ſuch notions concerning this Scripture, as need not ſo confidently boaſt of [neither colour nor ſhadow of our Doctrine,] leſt by them upon the place.

4. If Chriſt loved his Diſciples, notwithſtanding their unworthy demeanour to the [*end of his being on earth*,] what ſhould hinder, but we may roundly inferre, he continues his love to all his Elect for ever *in heaven*, their failings notwithſtanding? though *they deny him, yet he abides faithful, he cannot deny himſelf*.

For

§. 40.

For the words of *Malachy*, *I am the Lord, I change not*; from which it is wont (and irrefragably) to be argued, *That when once God loves a person, he never ceaseth to love him*; becauſe this muſt needs argue a changeableneſſe in him, in reſpect of his affection; and conſequently, *that the Saints cannot fall away finally from his grace.* You anſwer three ſeveral wayes.

[1. That by the tenor of this arguing, it would as well follow, that in caſe God ſhould at any time withdraw his love, or favour from a Nation, or body of People, which he ſometimes favoured, or loved, he ſhould be changed; but that no ſuch change of diſpenſation towards one and the ſame people, argueth a change in God, is evident.]

I reply, The caſe is extreamly different. Gods *diſpenſations* may *alter* without a *change* in *God*; even his *diſpenſations* towards his *Elect*, are oft-times *contrary one* to *another*, *abſolutely* conſidered in their own *nature*; but with *reference* either to *Gods will*, or his *elects ſalvation*, they are not; his *correcting* and *comforting* them, his *deſerting* and *ſhining* upon them, are in *themſelves contrary*; but *all* theſe were *willed* by him at *once* from all *eternity*, and that in order to *their ſalvation*, whereunto his *corrections* contribute no leſſe, then his *comforts* vouchſafed unto them; his *deſerting* of them, no leſſe, then his *ſhining* upon them. Theſe *contrary diſpenſations* iſſue from the *ſame conſtant love in him*, and tend to the *ſame eternal happineſſe* of his *Elect*. The *chief thing* aimed at in *all theſe*, next unto his own *glory*.

But by your leave, when he deales thus variouſly with a *Nation*; albeit theſe *various diſpenſations* argue no *change* in *him*, becauſe he from all eternity *decreed all theſe variations*; yet do *none of them* argue any *ſuch love in God* to this *Nation*, as he is pleaſed to bear to his *Elect*. He ſo loved his *Elect* from all eternity, that he *decreed them* (ſay *we*) to *eternal happineſſe*; he decreed not any *Nation* on *Earth*, that we ever yet heard of, to *everlaſting glory* in *heaven*; but becauſe he decreed *more of one Nation* then *another* to this glory of heaven, had *more Elect in one Nation then another*, and *more Elect at one time or age in the ſame Nation*, then at *another*; hence ariſeth the *difference* of his *diſpenſations* of *love*, more to *one* Nation then *another*, and more to the *ſame* Nation at *one* time then *another*. It is *all* done in order to the ſalvation of his *Elect*; God having been pleaſed to chuſe *heires of heaven*, *chiefly* out of the *Nation* of the *Jewes*, for *ſome ages*; he gave *that Nation*, till *that number* were filled, his *Ordinances* and *Statutes more* then any *other* Nation; yea, upon the matter to *that* Nation *onely*: he having been pleaſed to chooſe Heires of heaven out of *all other Nations* in the *latter ages*; he accordingly *gives* his *Ordinances* to *all other Nations* in thoſe *ages*, *wherein* he hath decreed *his Elect* of thoſe Nations ſhould be *borne*; and *till* ſuch time he *with-holds* his *Ordinances* from thoſe *Nations*, as his *Elect* among the *Jewes* for *thoſe ages* being *gathered*, he *withdrew* his *Ordinances* from *that Nation*, with a purpoſe to *give them* again in a *time*, when he had ordained that a conſiderable *number of his Elect* ſhould be *borne*.

So that all this *variation* of his *diſpenſations* towards *Nations*, proceeds from his *conſtant* and *unchangeable* love to his *Elect*. It is for *their ſakes* that he *beſtowes* his bleſſings upon the *Nation*, whereof they are *a part*, and though perhaps *farre the leaſt*; yet *farre the beſt*, and moſt *precious*.

When you ſay, [that neither the changableneſſe, nor unchangableneſſe of God are to be eſtimated, or meaſured, either by any variety, or uniformity of diſpenſation towards one and the ſame object:]

I muſt confeſſe, I underſtand not your meaning of [the changableneſſe of God;] but ſure God is *unchangable* in *all* the *changes* of his *diſpenſations*, as being *all* ordered *unchangably* from *eternity*, to *one* and the *ſame end*. He decreed from all eternity in his *immutable counſel*, all the *mutations* of his *diſpenſations*; *plucking down*, as well as *building up*; *caſting off*, as well as *gathering in*; *withdrawing*, as well as *communicating* his bleſſings.

But when you proceed, [And conſequently for him to expreſſe himſelf to day towards a perſon, man, or woman, as if he intended to ſave them, or that he really

ally intends to ſave them, and to morrow, (as the alteration in the *interim* may be, or however may be ſuppoſed in theſe perſons,) expreſſe himſelf to the contrary; as that he verily intends to deſtroy them, would not argue, or imply the leaſt change, or alteration in him;] I muſt needs ſay, it is ſomewhat yet that you ſay, [to expreſſe himſelf thus, would not imply, &c.] but ſurely, 1. Never did he *thus expreſſe himſelf.* 2. If he *ſhould*, this by your leave would argue an *alteration in him.* God doth expreſſe at moſt, but a *mans deſert*, that God ſhould *damne him*; never his *own intention* to *damne* a man, to whom he *once expreſſed that he intended to ſave him.* God may expreſſe, that he intendeth not to ſave the man, while he continues in ſuch a way; but to ſay, that [God may expreſſe an intention, while the man continues in ſuch a way, not to ſave him;] is to ſay, that either God *expreſſeth an intention* which he *hath not*, which were to *lie*, or elſe that he hath at *one time one intention*, at *another time another*, which were to be *changed.* And that [God ſhould expreſſe himſelf to day that he really intends to ſave a man, and to morrow that he verily intends to deſtroy him;] cannot be done, without an *expreſſe profeſſion* of *change in his intentions. You* who will have *Gods intentions to be changeable thus*, do little conſult the *honour* of his *immutability*; and however you would put the *occaſion of this alteration* in the *man*; yet by your leave, the *formality of it* muſt be in *God.* Nor is it congruous to the *immutability of God*, to ſay, that he may change his intentions upon any *occaſion whatſoever* in the creature; the making his intentions to depend, and turne upon the hinges of occaſions, preſented anew, forſooth, by the creature, caſts too great and darke a ſhadow of turning on him, who is *the Father of lights, with whom is no poſſibility of variableneſs*, in the leaſt and minuteſt degree.

When you cloſe this with your [Yea, when as in one houre God conferred upon the lapſed Angels the greateſt happineſſe they were capable of, and in the next houre, perhaps ſooner, their ſin intervening, he caſt them out of his ſight into the greateſt miſerie; this argued no change, or ſhadow of change, or turning in God,] you ſpeak not *truth* in *all* of it, nor that which is *pertinent* in *any part* of this grave ſentence.

Firſt, that [the lapſed Angels had as much happineſſe conferred upon them as they were capable of,] is a ſufficient ſtretch.

I had thought they had been [*capable*] of as much, as thoſe of their kinſmen, that ſtood, and were confirmed; who ſure have ſomewhat more then they had, *before they were confirmed.* And that [*the lapſed Angels are caſt into the greateſt miſery*,] is not ſo ſaid; but that you muſt qualifie it with ſomewhat to help it againſt an objection of a *future addition* to be made to their torment in their *time*, and a *poſſible addition* even after *that*; unleſſe either their torment be *infinite* in *intention*, which how a *finite nature* ſhould be *capable* of, none but ſuch a *Seraphical Doctor* as *you* can conceive; or *Gods hand* be not *capable* of elevating their *finite torment* any one the leaſt *degree*, or *ſcruple higher*; but let that paſſe.

When you are ſpeaking of [Gods expreſſing himſelf, to intend now to ſave a man, anon to damne him,] what boots it to adde, of [Gods conferring ſo great happineſſe in *one* houre on the lapſed Angels, and caſting them into ſo great miſery in *another*? We ſay, he *intended* to caſt them into that *great miſery*, before he *conferred that great happineſſe* upon them; and that though here were a *variation* in Gods *diſpenſations*, yet that *all* were in purſuance of his *one eternal intention* to manifeſt his *glory* in *puniſhing* them to all eternity for their *Apoſtaſy*, which he intended from all eternity to permit. Had his *intention* accommodated it ſelf according to the *variation* of their *demeanure*, as his *execution* did, *his intention* had been *changed* as well as *their eſtate*; and ſo the *Father of lights had not been without a ſhadow of turning*, upon the *turne* of the *Angels of darkneſſe.*

We ſay therefore, that *Gods diſpenſations*, though *various in themſelves*, are *all uniforme* in regard of their ſuitableneſſe to Gods *decree*, which was ſtill *one* and the *ſame*; and to that one and the ſame *end*, whereunto he decreed theſe *divers* and *contrary* diſpenſations.

You

§. 41.

You proceed,

[2. That unchangableneſſe which God in the Scriptures aſſerts to himſelf, is to be conſidered only in reſpect of his Eſſence, Attributes, and Decrees; and not in reſpect of any conſtancy, or ſameneſſe of tenor in his diſpenſations towards the ſame creatures, whether they be changed, or no.]

Right, but ſhort; the *changes* of the *creatures* do *all* fall under *Gods decree*; *this decree* doth not conforme it ſelf to the *changes of the creatures*; he decreed to *effect* ſome changes, to *permit* others in the creatures; and accordingly to *varie his diſpenſations* towards them, which yet ſtill run in the *ſame tenor*, in reference to *his decree* looking *backwards*, and looking *forwards* to the *end* whereto he decreed them.

Again, 1. What you ſay of the unchangableneſſe of Gods Eſſence; is *true*, but ſlight, [that nothing can be added to him, nothing taken from him, nothing altered, or made otherwiſe; that he is the ſame, and his years have no end;] but though his *yeares* have no end, it ſeemes *his intentions* and *purpoſes*, according to you, may; but this is that which we ſay is no way conſiſtent with to the infiniteneſſe of GOD.

The *unchangableneſſe of Gods Eſſence*, we demonſtrate from his *perfection*; his *perfection*, from his *ſimplicity*; his *ſimplicity*, from his *priority before all things*; conſequently his *independency* from *all* things, and *all things depending from him*.

2. What you adde of the unchangableneſſe of his Attributes, is after the ſame rate; [that he is not more wiſe, or powerful at one time, and leſſe at another; albeit he may ſhew more wiſdome, and power, or rather more ſhew his wiſdome and power at one time then another;] but by your leave, your hanging his *intentions* in ſuſpenſe, makes not much for the glory of his *wiſdome*, or *power*, which are faine to attend the motions of the creatures; and as they pleaſe to *determine themſelves*, ſo according to you, doth *God variouſly determine* to proportion his particular diſpenſations towards them. *We* ſay, Gods determination of *all theſe various diſpenſations*, was *one* and the *ſame* from all *eternity*; and are bold to ſay, that your aſſerting, [that God may deſtroy with eternal death, thoſe whom he ſometimes loved, and reſpected dearly, ſo as to intend ſalvation to them,] ſtrikes not only at the *immutability*, but many *other perfections* of the Divine Nature.

Nor ſeemes it to me to be too judiciouſly ſpoken by you, when [you compare God with a Judge, who being of a ſweet and loving diſpoſition towards all men, conſidered as men, eſpecially as good men; yet according unto the Lawes, whereunto he is ſworne, and the equity of the caſe, awards a ſentence of death againſt one, or more of them, without any alteration of his ſweet diſpoſition and love; yea, even to the perſons whom he condemneth.]

I pray what think you, 1. If this tender-hearted Judge had had the *hearts* of thoſe men whom he condemneth in his own hand, would not he have *prevented their offences*, and ſo his *ſentence*? And hath not *God* the *hearts of all men in his hand*? and is not *he able* to keep them, if he pleaſed, from *all ſin*? and after they have ſinned, is he but as a *Judge*, tied up by Law? might not he uſe his prerogative, and diſpenſe with this ſentence? and doth he not diſpenſe with *ſome*, that commit *greater* ſins? and could he not as well do ſo to *others* that commit *leſſer*? change their hearts, and ſave their lives? Surely if God did [dearly love, and reſpect a man,] he would eaſily finde means to *prevent* his running into ſuch *miſchievous miſcarriages*, as ſhould draw the *irreverſible ſentence* of *eternal death on him*. Tell us, I pray, doth he forbear to do it, either for want of *wiſdome*, to ſhew the man whom he ſo [dearly loves, and reſpects,] how to avoid theſe miſcarriages? or want of *power*, to *turne* the mans *heart*, ſo as to make a *right uſe* of what God in his *wiſdome* doth *ſhew him*? or for want of *wiſdome*, *at leaſt to manage this power* to the beſt advantage of the ſaving of the man, whom he is ſuppoſed thus [dearly to love and reſpect?] Nay, and if he ſo [dearly love, and reſpect the man,] is it either *for the mans goodneſſe*?

and then *that* ſtanding in conjunction with *Gods power* and *wiſdome*, and [dear love and *reſpect* to him;] will it render it ſomewhat the more *facile* a work for God to *preſerve him for the preſerving of the honour of his power*, wiſdome, and [dear love and reſpect?] or is it *without the mans goodneſſe* and then it ſeemes God is a *reſpecter of perſons*, according to the preſent grave ſuppoſition; or rather is it *for the goodneſſe which God hath been pleaſed to work in the man*, thus [dearly loved and reſpected?] and then either God wrought this goodneſſe in him, *when there was ſomewhat more goodneſſe in him then others*, and ſo *that* moved God to do *that*; *Whence* he owes this [tender love and reſpect of God to him,] originally to *himſelf* and his *own initial goodneſſe*, which drew this [dear love and reſpect] of God to him; or elſe God wrought it in him, *when he was no better then others*; and then God who *made him good, when he was yet as bad as others*, and ſhewed in *this* ſo much *more* [*dear love and reſpect to him*] then to many others, in whom he *wrought no ſuch goodneſſe*, muſt needs be ready to *continue* his [dear love and reſpect] to him, now God hath *made him better then others*; and this [dear love and reſpect,] muſt needs finde his *power*, or *wiſdome*, or *both* at a loſſe, if it do not keep him from being *ſo bad*; that he *grow worſe* then he was at *firſt*, when God *found* him ſtark *naught*, and yet *made* him ſo *good*, that he vouchſafed to ſhew him ſo much [dear love and reſpect] upon this account.

Now I go on with you, and aske, whether this man whom God ſo [dearly loved and reſpected] after his fall, be ſtill loved and reſpected ſo dearly by God, or no? if not, here's an *abatement* of Gods [love and dear reſpect,] a clear *change* if he be ſtill *loved* and *reſpected* by him ſo dearly after his fall; I aske again, whether this [dear love and reſpect] of God, cannot raiſe him *to* and *by repentance*, and ſo *prevent the* irreverſible ſentence? or if it cannot do it yet perhaps, whiles he is more ſignally obſtinate, yet whether this [dear love and reſpect] cannot take a little time, till it may *finde* him in a more tractable humour, when it may deal with him upon better termes? and whether in the mean time, it cannot *preſerve* his *temporall* life, that it may *prevent* his *eternal death*?

But, 2. When [you compare God with a Judge, who ſtill dearly loves and reſpects the perſons whom he hath condemned to die, as much as he did befor their delinquency.] I pray, doth not this imply, that God dearly loves and reſpects the damned; yea, as much as he did before? and truly I think he doth all alike, in regard of any *affection of love*; though it is true his *diſpenſations* favoured of *more love before* then they *deſerved*, and of *leſſe hatred ſince* then they are *worthy* of, it is ſtill *citra condignum*.

It is true, that [Gods deſtroying with eternal death, ſuch perſons as have Apoſtatized, and died impenitently; though he for a long time ſhewed patience and bounty unto them, argues no alteration in God;] but did God *once* [dearly love and reſpect thoſe perſons,] he muſt be confeſt, to *alter his love*, and *reſpect*, in *ſuffering* them to *Apoſtatize*, and *die in impenitency*; but that he did ever *ſuffer any* whom he [dearly loved and reſpected] thus to *Apoſtatize*, and *die in impenitency*, I deny; Nor can you prove, that any who were ever faithful, and obedient unto him, did ſo *Apoſtatize*, and *die in impenitency*. Alas, Sir, thoſe who *Apoſtatize*, and *die in impenitency*, as [*obedient*] as you take them to be, God knowes, their *obedience* was not *faithful*, and that even then, when you think they were faithful and obedient ſubjects, and ſervants to him, they were *ſubtile traitours*, and would upon any occaſion, have diſcovered themſelves to be *deſperate enemies* to his holy Majeſty; and ſo albeit they partook of *more mercies*, then they had *cauſe to expect*; yet had they *no intereſt* in that [dear love and reſpect of God to them,] which you ſo wiſely pretend.

But as if you had hitherto ſpoken little and over-modeſtly; you adde, [Nay, if God ſhould not deſtroy ſuch perſons, in ſuch caſes, or upon ſuch a ſuppoſition, it would argue a manifeſt alteration in ſome of his Attributes, as ſeverity, hatred of ſin, truth, &c. yea haply if the matter be narrowly conſidered, even in his love, or goodneſſe it ſelf.]

I reply, 1. That I do not read, where [ſeverity, or hatred againſt ſin,] are reckoned among the *Attributes* of God; if ſo, then God muſt be alwayes *ſevere againſt all ſin*, in whom ever it is found; and if ſo, how I pray can *any men* be ſaved? he is ſevere againſt all *impenitent ſinners*; But ſure he ſaith for his people, *I will be mercifull to their ſins, and their iniquities will I remember no more.* [Hatred againſt ſin] we yield, [ſeverity againſt ſin] I deny, can be reckoned among the *Attributes of God. Hatred againſt ſin*, ſignifies but a *deteſtation of the ſin*; *ſeverity* againſt *ſin*, would inferre the *deſtruction of the ſinner*; which God forbid, *durus eſt hic ſermo*; Alas, Maſter, if God ſhould be ſevere againſt ſin in us, which of us could eſcape? *O Lord, who ſhould ſtand?*

2. That it is true, [If God ſhould not deſtroy Apoſtates dying in impenitency, there would be a change in ſome of his Attributes;] but becauſe there can be no change in his Attributes, as his *Truth* and *faithfulneſs*; therefore *never ſhall any of thoſe God dearly loves and reſpects, ſo Apoſtatize* as *to die in impenitency.* He hath promiſed to *heale their backſlidings*, and to *keep them from every evil work unto his heavenly Kingdome*; and though the matter be not over [narrowly conſidered,] it will appear ſufficiently upon a light examination, that ſuch a permiſſion of his Saints, whom he dearly loves and reſpects, to fall into ſuch Apoſtaſie, and lie in it till death, would inferre an inſufferable change in his love, and goodneſſe, his *mercy* which *he will never take from them*, and his *truth which he will never ſuffer to faile.*

Well, but we have the patience to hear your profound reaſon for this your Propoſition, and it is this: [For if we judge it any part, or property of the love or goodneſſe of God towards goodneſſe and good men, to put ſo great and gracious a difference between them, and between wickedneſſe and wicked men, as to reward the former with eternall glory, the latter with eternall ſhame and miſery; and that he hath at any time expreſſed his love and goodneſſe in this kinde; evident it is, that in caſe he ſhould at any time not puniſh perſevering Apoſtates, which are the wickedſt of men, with eternal death; it would argue an alteration, or change in thoſe Attributes of his we ſpeak of.] Very good; but it would argue ſuch a *change*, if he ſhould *ſuffer* thoſe whom he *truly loves, and dearly reſpects*, to become *ſuch perſevering Apoſtates*, as to fall under the puniſhment of *eternal death.* Did they become *perſevering Apoſtates*, it indeed would argue a *change* in his *juſtice*, if he ſhould not puniſh them with *eternal death*; but it would argue no leſſe a *change in his mercy*, if he ſhould not *preſerve them from ſuch perſevering Apoſtaſy* to *eternal life*: He being *able*, I trow, and having as much *will* as *ability* to do it. 2. As it is a part of Gods goodneſſe to wards goodneſſe and good men, to put ſuch a difference between them, and between wickedneſſe and wicked men, as to reward them according to their ſeveral works: So the whole goodneſſe of good men comes *from God*, as it is wont to be acknowledged, and from his *free pleaſure*; and many times he workes it in thoſe who were moſt *wicked*, when he works *no ſuch goodneſs* in *thoſe that are leſſe wicked.*

Now would it not argue a ſtrange alteration in Gods love to goodneſſe, and good men, if he ſhould leave theſe, whom being *worſe* then many *others*, he in love was pleaſed to make *good*, to become after they were made ſo *good* through his love, *perſevering Apoſtates*, whom you not unjuſtly brand as the wickedſt of men?

And therefore I conclude, that to argue thus: *If God ſhould love a man to day, and hate him to morrow, it would argue a ſtrange inconſtancy, and mutability in God*; however you pleaſe to call it, [a very inconſiderate, and weak reaſoning,] is to reaſon at ſuch a rate of ſtrength, and validity, as all your Arguments hitherto produced, are of no conſiderable power to oppoſe it.

But it may be there is more force in what followes, [For the conſtancy, or unchangeableneſſe of the love of God doth not ſtand in his conſtant loving the ſame perſon, or object, materially conſidered; but only as conſidered formally, *i. e.* as remaining the ſame morally, or in lovelineſſe, which it was when he firſt loved it.]

I beſeeech you what [lovelineſſe,] what [morality] was there in *Jacob, before he had done good*? and yet even *then* God ſaid *he loved him*; yea, what [lovelineſs,] was there in that *Infant* when *it was in its blood?* Ezek. 16. And yet *was that unto God the time of love.* You think, it ſeemes, the Apoſtle was too forward, to ſay, *Not that we loved him, but he loved us firſt*, as in giving his *Son*, ſo his *Spirit* to us, when we were *enemies*; and in *juſtifying the ungodly.*

[*Iulian* the Profeſſor, and *Iulian* the Apoſtate, (I yield you) are the ſame perſon, or object materially conſidered; but in a formall conſideration they are two,] and theſe very different; and *Paul* the Perſecutor, and *Paul* the Apoſtle, are I think as much the ſame object [materially,] and in a [formal conſideration] as much two. Now as God *loved Paul, while a Perſecutor, ſo farre* as to make him an *Apoſtle* by his *grace*; ſo he did not *love Iulian* the *Profeſſour, ſo farre* as to *keep him* from being an *Apoſtate*, which his *grace* wanted not *power* to have done; but might, we might think of the *two*, farre more eaſily have *preſerved* Julian *the Profeſſour*, then *converted* Paul *the Perſecutour.*

But, Sir, God *loved* Paul *from eternity*, ſo as to *decree* to make him an *Apoſtle of a Perſecutor*; and did *not ſo love* Julian, but that he *decreed* to permit him to become an *Apoſtate* of a *Profeſſor.* His *Spirit blowes where it liſts*; ſurely it ſtill blowes in *love*, on whomſoever it *blowes*; that *love* cannot be to the *perſon* under your [*formal conſideration as good*;] what goodneſſe is there *before the Spirit blow* in any of us? but meerely God ſhewes his pleaſure, *in having mercy on whom he will have mercy. It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth*; *but* all *of God that ſheweth mercy*, and *to whom he will.*

What you ſay of the Angels in their integrity, and lapſed condition, that [they are one and the ſame object, materially conſidered; but that they formally differ as much as light and darkneſſe,] is *true*; but what of that? Why, [to argue that unleſſe God ſhould alwayes love the ſame perſons, materially conſidered, whom he once, or at any time loved, he ſhould be mutable in his love, neceſſarily ſuppoſeth either that God hated the lapſed Angels, while they were yet holy, and in the glory and beauty of their Creation; or elſe that he now loves them in their Apoſtaſy.]

I anſwer, God in the glory and beauty of their Creation *loved* them *ſo farre*, as that they owed that *glory and beauty* of their *Creation* to his *bounty*; but he did *not love them ſo farre* as to give them his *grace*, whereby to *preſerve* them in this glory and beauty of their Creation; which yet he was pleaſed to beſtow (I conceive out of love) on thoſe that ſtand. Now in Scripture-phraſe your learning knowes, that *leſſe love* beares the name of *hatred*; and if ſuch *hatred* of the *reprobate Angels* be attributed to God, even *while they ſtood*, it is no more diſhonourable to him, then *his hatred of* Eſau *before he had done evil*, which God ownes; and what *good* the lapſed Angels did, while in the beauty and glory of their Creation, is more then we are ever like to learne; unleſſe your Angelical Doctorſhip ſhall think fit to ſtudy this deep point, and pleaſe to communicate to us your rare diſcoveries.

But, 2. By what you have already delivered, *Chap.* 16. We may more then gueſs, they never did any good at all; for had they but once loved God, which they muſt needs have done if they did any good; they could never have ceaſed to love him, [becauſe of the inflexibleneſſe of their wills from any point, where they have once pitcht,] of which you moſt ſubtilly diſpute at large.

So then theſe Angels in their integrity, did nothing that I know, to merit of God ſo much love as to confirme them; nor will (I dare ſay) the Angels that ſtand, ſay that themſelves did; and therefore God giving theſe grace, whereby to ſtand, which he gave not to thoſe that fell, whom yet he could as eaſily have ſupplied, ſhewes that he loved thoſe that fell even whiles they ſtood, leſſe then thoſe that ſtand to this day, out of all danger of falling: and this leſſe love may be well enough ſtiled *hatred*, according to the uſuall Idiome of Holy Scripture.

But yet all this was but a *negative hatred*, in the [beauty and glory of their Creation;]

tion;] *that* which God *now ſhewes to them*, is *poſitive*; but he ſhewes no more *now*, then he bare them from all *eternity*. God *intended* from all eternity, whatever he will *inflict* on them to all eternity; or elſe all Mr. *Goodwins* admired *acumen* is not able to avoid a *change* and *alteration* in him.

But ſtill you proceed, and tell us, [The truth is, that ſhould God alwayes love the ſame perſons, though morally diſtinguiſhed from themſelves, and of righteous become wicked and abominable;] (we ſay, he ſo loves his Saints, that he preſerves them from becoming wicked and abominable,) [this would clearly argue a change in his affection, as it would in the affection of ſuch a man, who ſhould love good men as good men; or good men only to day, and wicked men to morrow;] Peace; God doth not ſimply love *good men*, as *good men*; but loves *ſome men*, ſo as to *make them good*, which he doth not make *others*. And *afterwards* he loves them ſo as *to give them that good*, which he gives not to *others*; he loves the *men* whom he intends to *make good*, even when they *are evil*, ſo as to give them the *graces of his Spirit*; he loves them not ſo as to give them the *comforts of his Spirt*, till he have by his *grace* changed them from *evil to good*.

You ſhut up all, [So that men who were ſometimes loved by God, may now be hated of him, without any the leaſt change, or alteration in him, or in his affection; only by meanes of a change, or alteration in themſelves.]

I pray, Sir, let *love* and *hatred* be *contrary affections*, and be the *occaſion* of this *contrariety* placed where you pleaſe; he that is the *ſubject* of theſe *contrary affections*, (as God muſt be conceived to be, if now he *love*, and to morrow *hate* the ſame man,) is alſo the *ſubject* of this *contrariety*; and this ſounds ſomewhat more then a *ſimple change*. God, it is true, is ſaid to be *angry* with thoſe men, whom afterwards he is ſaid to *love*, in reſpect of his *diſpenſations*; but he *loved them* even from all *eternity* in reſpect of his *deſignes*, and *decrees*, which are,

The third and laſt particular, ſay you, [wherein the unchangeableneſſe of God is to be conſidered;] and theſe you are content to acknowledge, [being truly ſtated, and underſtood, are all abſolute and unchangeable; ſhall, and will take place, againſt all contradictions, and oppoſitions whatſoever.] And that is enough for our purpoſe; God *decreed the ſalvation of his Elect*, and therefore they ſhall be *kept unto it*, in ſpight of all [contradictions and oppoſitions whatſoever;] but the truth is, in your *Chap.* 3. *Sect.* 18, 20. whither you referre us; you make the decrees of God to be only *general*, and not *particular*; and ſo theſe decrees of *your propoſing*, will not do *our work*; but we are ready to make it good, *that God decreed particular mens ſalvation*, and have ſufficiently done it in our examination of your quoted Chapter and Section.

I apply my ſelf to what you have to ſay upon the place, where we now meet; and to my ſeeming you here give us as good words as we could deſire. [The unchangeableneſſe here aſſumed by God, (ſay you) is that which is found in him, in reſpect of his decrees. The reaſon is, becauſe it is aſſigned by him, as the Reaſon, why they were not utterly deſtroyed: *I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye ſonnes of* Jacob *are not conſumed.* In the beginning of this Chapter, he had declared his purpoſe of ſending his only begotten Sonne, he predicteth *verſ.* 3, 4. the happy fruits or conſequences of that his ſending, in reference to their Nation and Poſterity. To the unchangeableneſſe of this his Decree, he aſſignes that patience, which he had for a long time exerciſed towards them, under their great and continued provocations; whereby he implies, that if he could have been put out of the way of his Decree, concerning the ſending of his Son unto them in their poſterity, they would have done it by the greatneſſe of their ſins. But inaſmuch as this his Decree was unchangeable, and yet muſt have been changed, if they had been all deſtroyed; (for the Decree was for the ſending his Son to their Nation and Poſterity,) hence ſaith he, it comes to paſſe, that though your ſinnes have abundantly deſerved it; yet I have ſpared you from a totall ruine; ſo that here is nothing for the common Doctrine of Perſeverance, but rather againſt it.]

I yield you have given a true representation of the occasion of these words; but why you should say, [there is nothing in them for the common Doctrine of Perseverance,] I cannot understand; much lesse can I see, how there is in them any thing [against it,] as you are pleased to speak in your wonted bravado.

I shall shew that they are so farre from having any thing [against] this Doctrine, as that they have abundance in them to confirme it beyond contradiction.

For if it be so, that the wickednesse of the Jewish Nation, were not able to make God revoke his Decree of sending his Sonne to that Nation; (albeit he sent not his Son for the salvation of the *Nation of the Iewes*, but the *chosen part of that Nation*, whom he could have preserved; though he had destroyed the Jewes from being a *Nation*, and made the *name of their Nation*, that it should be no more remembred;) then much lesse can the wickednesse of the *chosen part of the world*, for whose sake God sent his *Son*, hinder God from *sending* his *Spirit* to them, and *continuing* the graces of it in them, till he bring them to heaven, as he hath decreed. The Argument is drawn *à majori ad minus*; *Greater wickednesse* could not hinder God from accomplishing a *lesse thing decreed*; therefore *lesse wickednesse* cannot hinder him from accomplishing a *greater thing* decreed.

The *sending of Christ to that Nation*, was *lesse*; the *saving of* those, for whose salvation Christ was sent, is *greater*; the *sinnes of the generality* of that Nation were *greater*; the *sins of Gods chosen* people, and effectually called are *lesse*: Therefore, if the sinnes of the Jewish *Nation* could not hinder God from *sending his Son* to that *Nation*, the sins of the *chosen people* of God, being effectually called, cannot hinder him from performing what he hath from eternity decreed, *their everlasting salvation*; though *we deny him, yet he abideth faithful and unchangeable, he cannot deny himself.*

The *saving of Gods chosen* was the *end*, the *sending of Christ* but the *meanes* to that *end*, and the *sending of Christ to that Nation* hath a *lesse* respect, *viz.* of the *meanes* to that *end*; and therefore the *saving of his chosen*, was much more aimed at in Gods Decree, then the *sending of his Son to the Nation of the Jewes*. Yea, the *sending of Christ* being the *meanes* ordained for the *salvation* of his *chosen people*; it must be confest, that the *salvation of his chosen people* was of the two rather *first in intention*, and therefore that which could *least* admit of a *defeasance*.

And besides you may please to consider, whether according to your rationall principles, *the sending of Christ might not possibly have been prevented by the wickednesse of the Iewes, notwithstanding all that God had determined in this particular*; as in case they had put the *Virgin* Mary *to death*, which they might have *done*, as well as you say the *crucifying of Christ* might have been *prevented*; belike by the *holinesse* and *tendernesse* of the Jewes, who might have been so *good*, as to have forborne the *crucifying of him.*

The truth is, there is much in *your Book*, against the certainty of the accomplishment of this decree of God, to send his Son to the Nation of the Jewes, *nothing* at all in this *Text* against the Doctrine which asserts the infallible salvation of the Elect decreed from all eternity, by that God, who is unchangable in *himself*, and whose *decrees* are all *irreversible*, and shall notwithstanding all opposition of men and devils, be punctually fulfilled in their respective seasons.

§. 42. You descend to another [parcell of Scripture fought out (as you word it) for the service of this Doctrine. It rests in these words: *And we know, that all things work together for good to them that love God, who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate, to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-borne among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them also he called; and whom he called, them also he justified; and whom he justified, them also he glorified*, Rom. 8. 28, 29.

From this contexture of Scripture it is frequently argued to this effect, that when men once love God, and are effectually called, *i. e.* are Regenerate, and do believe they are fastned to one end of a certain chaine, consisting of several Decrees of God, like so many linkes, indissolubly fastned one to another; and hereby

are

are infallibly, and irresistibly drawn unto glory; and consequently cannot fall away, or perish finally.]

Sir, you will be pleased not to take it amisse, that I am bold to say, you have not made so faire a representation of our collection, as becomes either us, or your self.

We use not to say, [That when men once love God, they are fastned to one end of the chaine, &c.] We say, the *Elect* were fastned to one end of the chaine from *all eternity*, that they were *fast* at *this end*, even while they were *enemies to God*; that *when they love God*, they are *fastned*, not at *one end*, but to a *middle linke* of the chaine, which supposeth them drawne by *many a linke before it*, and draw *many another golden linke after it*. *Their love to God*, is neither *end* of the chaine; from this *their love to God*; they go *backward* from *linke* to *linke* to their *Election from eternity*, and *forward* to their *glory to eternity*.

From *their love to God* they ascend to *Gods love to them*, and acknowledge with all humility, that albeit *their love to God* be first in *ordine cognoscendi*; yet *Gods love to them*, is first in *ordine essendi*; yea, is the *cause* of *their love to him*; and *their love to him*, is an *infallible evidence* of *his love to them*. It were strange, *they* should be *better* affected to *God*, then *God to them*; or that *they* should be *well affected to God*, unlesse *God* out of *his* dear *love* to them, had *wrought* this *gracious affection in them*.

Now if *God love them*, they conclude, *he loved them when they hated him*, so farre as *to make them to love him*, who naturally *hated him*, his *being*, and *glory*; his *truth*, and *righteousnesse*; his *Law*, and *Gospel*; and *he* who *loved* them *while they thus hated him*, they rationally conclude, will not *forbear* to *love them*, now that *he* hath *brought them to love him*; and if out of *his love to them*, he *turned* their hearts from *hatred* to *love* to *him*; they of course inferre, *he is able to keep their hearts* from *turning* back from *love* to *hatred* of him; and that accordingly he *will* bring them at length by *such meanes* as he hath appointed, to those *blessed mansions*, where they shall *have the glory*, to *give glory to him without end*, for his *goodnesse to them* before the *beginning of the world*.

And thus from *their love to God*, which they acknowledge to be, as all their graces are, like *themselves*, *weak* and *feeble*, do they come up to the consideration of the *love of God to them*, which is like *his glorious Essence*, infinitely beyond all possibility of *variation*, and consequently their *salvation* is *sure* and *certaine*.

To our Argument, as you have pleased to propound it, you returne an answer; wherein you gravely tell us, [that inasmuch as this Scripture is also impressed for the service of the Doctrine of absolute personal Election, you intend to reckon with it hereafter, when your method shall call you to that businesse; at the present you consider it, as made use of by us on the present occasion, to maintaine the certaine perseverance of persons Regenerate, as infallibly drawn to glory by a *series* or chaine of Decrees, uninterruptedly succeeding, or taking hold one of another.]

I pray (Sir) vouchsafe to remember, that we make our *personal election*, the *first linke of this chaine*; and that which hath a *secret*, but *certaine efficacy* on *all the rest*; and build the *whole businesse* on this *foundation* of *Election*, so that we say, the *purpose of God*, though *last* in the order of *expression*, is the *first* in that of *nature*. We look *first* to *Gods purpose of mercy*; then to *his calling*, arising from that *purpose*; then to *our love of God*, arising from *that calling*; then to the *working of all things together for our good*, issuing from *Gods faithfulnesse* to his own *purposes*, *Tender love* over his *Elect*, *Sovereigne power* and *providence* over *all things* in the world; which of *themselves* cannot *work* at *all* without him, much lesse *altogether*; (they look *too contrary ways* to aime at the *same end*,) much lesse *altogether for good*, *most* of them intending nothing but *evil*; and least of all *for good to those that love God*, against whom they are apt to project, and endeavour the *greatest evil*.

We look chiefly to *Gods hand working all things to good*; and though we do not approve *Cajetans* construction of ἀ παντα συνεργει, by *cooperatur omnia*, as for the Grammar, yet we do as for the Logick of it; and we conceive the sense of the Apostle

poſtle to be this, that God having ſet his favour on his choſen from all eternity, and in his good time called them by the inward efficacious working of the Spirit of grace, and wrought in them a love of himſelf upon the conſideration of his love to them; he will, how mightily ſoever all things almoſt, may ſeem to oppoſe the work of *his grace in them, their workes by grace* in order to *his glory, his workes* in reference to *their glory*; he will (I ſay) ſo powerfully over-rule all, as to make even thoſe things which are confederate againſt him and his people, plotting moſt ſubtilly, and acting moſt ſtrenuouſly againſt them, unawares to contribute ſomewhat to his bleſſed end, the glory of his own Name in the ſalvation of theſe his peoples ſoules, and that even by their curſed endeavours to oppoſe it: for in ſpight of all he will purſue his own purpoſe, and make all things whatever ſubſervient unto it, till he have firſt *juſtified* thoſe whom he called according to his purpoſe, and then at laſt *glorified them.* This we take to be the ſcope of the place, and ſo our Argument to be good, which concludes hence the infallible perſeverance of perſons Regenerate, becauſe of Gods eternall purpoſe to bring them by theſe ſteps to glory, and all the ſubordination things to his purpoſe; *If he be for us, who can be againſt us?*

Well, but againſt this you reply, and tell us another ſtory of the ſcope of the Text, which in brief is this:

[That the Apoſtles aime in the ſequel of this paſſage, is to ſhew the truth of that aſſertion, *We know that all things work together for good, &c.*] Right, [that to prove this, he ſhewes by what method, ſteps, and, as it were, degrees of diſpenſation, God will bring it to paſſe;] Good ſtill; [*Whom he foreknowes*, ſaith he, *i. e.* approves, as he muſt *A.* 1. needs do thoſe that love him, *thoſe* he *predeſtinates to be conformed to the image of his Son*; and therefore as *All things*, even his *deepeſt ſufferings, wrought together for good to him*; ſo muſt they needs do *unto thoſe who are predeſtinated to a conformity unto him.*] Well, but a little too ſhort. [To give you yet (ſaith our Apoſtle) a clearer account, how God in the ſecret of his counſel hath belayed things in order to the bringing unto an actual conformity with *the image of his Son in glory*, thoſe whom he hath *predeſtinated*, thereunto, (who are ſuch as *A.* 2. love him, and therenpon are approved by him;)] here you begin to ſhew your ſelf, [you are to underſtand, that whom he hath ſo *predeſtinated*, he hath alſo *called*; *i.e.* hath *B.* purpoſed, or decreed to call, *i.e.* to the knowledge of his Son and Goſpel; *i.e.* to afford *C.* a more plaine and effectual diſcovery of it to them, then others *D.* whom he hath not ſo predeſtinated.] Here I know not what to make of you, eſpecially when [you adde by the way, this call *E.* doth not neceſſarily ſuppoſe a ſaving anſwer given unto it by the called, no whit more then the calling mentioned, *Matth.* 20. 16. *Matth.* 22. 14.] Worſe and worſe [only it ſuppoſeth *F.* a reall purpoſe, and intent on Gods part, to make it very ſufficient to procure ſuch an anſwer to it, from thoſe that are *called.* The Apoſtle advanceth further, and addes, *Whom he called, them he juſtified*, i.e. decreed to juſtifie in caſe the *G. called* obſtruct him not in his way, or by their unbelief render themſelves uncapable of *juſtification* by him. The clauſe following is to be underſtood with the like proviſo: *And whom he hath juſtified, them he hath alſo glorified*, i. e. hath purpoſed, or decreed to ſave, and glorifie them, in caſe they retaine the grace of juſtification conferred upon them unto thend, and do not make ſhipwrack of their faith, upon which it was conferred.]

Thus you give the Apoſtles ſenſe, and that you do not wrong us in your relation; but that he is all along to be underſtood with your proviſo, you endeavour to prove by three ſeveral Arguments.

I will conſider them in their turne; but in the mean time muſt crave leave to review this; and that the Reader may not be cloyed with too much repetition of your words, as worthy as they are of it, as which *decies repetita placebunt*; I ſhall deſire him to take notice of the Letters which I have uſed, to ſave my ſelf ſome labour in *tranſcribing*, as much delight as ſome others muſt needs take in *reading* your moſt excellent, and holy paſſages,

A. 1. I beſeech you, doth [God approve men, that is, as he calls it, foreknow them, becauſe they love him?] it ſeemes then we have cauſe to thank *our ſelves* for the *principal cauſe* of *Gods favour to us*, built upon *our love to him*, and not meerly, nor primarily, on *his love to us*; ſo much was the Apoſtle overſeen, when he ſaid, *Not that we firſt loved him, but he loved us*; and ſo much are all other good men out, when they conceive, not without too much wrong to themſelves, that *their love to God, was wrought by Gods love to them*, working their hearts againſt their *natural bent* and inclination to *love him*.

B. 2. I pray, do men love God before they are called to the knowledge of his Son and Goſpel? we humbly conceived *till* they were called to the knowledge of his Son and Goſpel, they had *hated God*; and upon the firſt mention of his Sonne and Goſpel, had been apt to *ſcorne* both his *Son* and his *Goſpel*; and to look upon the *Croſſe of Chriſt* as a ſilly thing; yea, that the Jewes themſelves had been ready to *ſtumble at it*, and not only the Greeks to account it *fooliſhneſſe*.

C. 3. Vouchſafe to ſhew us, when your important affaires will permit you, how this [*that God affords a more plaine and effectual diſcovery of his Goſpel to ſuch as love him, then others*,] will conſiſt either, with what Chriſt adventured to ſay, belike not adviſedly enough; that the *myſteries of* the Goſpel were *communicated* to *Harlots*, and *Publicans*, who we think, did *not love* God *more then others*, and were *concealed* from the *wiſe and prudent*, who had more *cauſe* at leaſt to *know more of God*, and accordingly were *more likely to love him*, then thoſe who were altogether ignorant of him in compariſon; *ignoti nulla cupido*. Or, 2. With what you have ſaid more then once, that equal means of knowing Chriſt, are given to all men, equal according to Geometrical proportion; which that you have moſt exactly calculated, none intimately acquainted with your rare skill in theſe Theological Logarithmes, can poſſibly doubt.

D. 4. But are there *any* whom God hath not *predeſtinated*? why then it ſeemes his love, and affections, ſtand not in an *uniformity towards all*, ever ſince his *Predeſtination*, which, we were wont to be taught, was from *all eternity*.

E. 5. But what is this, that [*this call of Gods part doth not neceſſarily ſuppoſe an anſwer given unto it by the called?*] an *outward call* it is true doth not; but a *call* whereupon *men love God*, or rather, as you carrie it, a *call becauſe men did firſt love God*, is not like to go off, as I fear many of my paſſages will, *without an anſwer*.

It ſeemes, *men may love God*, and ſo farre as to *invite God to call upon them*, purely by the ſtrength of their *natural abilities*, weakly aſſiſted with a little *univerſal grace*; but yet when *God* pleaſeth to *call upon them*, with a *purpoſe* to have an *anſwer* from them, that may be for *his glory*, and *their good*, they may turne the *deaf ear* to him, at leaſt anſwer him no more, then if they were dumbe. But is there no difference between *the called* here in the Text, and thoſe, *Matth.* 20. 16. *Matth.* 22. 14. both, I confeſſe, are κλητοὶ, but theſe in this Text are κλητοὶ κατὰ πρόθεσιν *that follower*, and *ſuch as love God* that goes *before* in the *expreſſion* of the Text; but in the *ſenſe* I ſhould think *Gods purpoſe* is *before their calling*, and *their love to God after their calling*; and how he who can and will make *all other things to work for good to theſe called*, ſhould let alone *theſe called to work themſelves ſo much evil*, as to *refuſe his call*; and yet *their love to God ſtanding*, is that which I am not like to learne, till I have the happineſſe to be indoctrinated by Mr. *Goodwin*. To me it ſeemes, that either theſe good men did *love God before he called on them*, or they were *wrought to this love of God by their call*; if they *loved God before*, and *now did not anſwer him*, this *call* was *one thing* which did not *work for their good*; at leaſt did not *work ſo effectually*, but that in the iſſue they were much the *worſe* for it.

F. 6. And how that conſiſts with the *honour of God*, [whoſe real purpoſe and intent it was, (as you are pleaſed to confeſſe,) to make it very ſufficient, to procure ſuch an anſwer from them;] my bluntneſſe will not eaſily be brought to conceive.

G. 7. That [God ſhould be ſaid to *have juſtified* them, becauſe he *decreed to*

justifie them;] I am willing enough to yield you. But, 1. How if *God decreed to justifie them the called* should obstruct him, is to me very obscure; I had thought he had been *able* to *remove all obstructions*; yea, to make *all obstructions* to *work together for their good and his glory*. 2. How [he decreed to justifie them with such a proviso,] is not so clear as you make it. I grant, he decreed to justifie them *by faith*, and *not without it*; but that his decree hung in suspense upon your *proviso*, and that it wanted a power to second it to *make them believe*, I deny.

H. 8. And as well may I, that the clause following, [*Whom he hath justified, them he hath also glorified*, admits the like exception, in case they do not make shipwrack of their faith;] Sir, he decreed to keep them, as apt as they were *of themselves* to make shipwrack of their faith, in the midst of all stormes, and tempests, and to bring them safe to the faire havens, whereto he had assigned them; and in his good time to land them in heaven. *If God be for us*, as the Apostle subjoynes, *ver.* 31. *who shall be against us?* belike *nothing else can*, but *we* may be *against our selves*, and so defeat God of his gracious purposes; Nay, *But he who hath given us his Sonne, how shall he not with him, give us all things also?* Faith, perseverance in it, and all other *spiritual blessings wherewith he hath blessed us in Christ Jesus?* Eph. 1. 3. You have ill provided by these your [*proviso's*] for the honour of God, and the happinesse of his Saints.

Having been bold to make this demurre, upon your limiting the words of the Apostle, with these your wary [*proviso's*;] I come now to examine the Arguments, which you are pleased to produce, for the better justifying your exceptions; And they are three.

First, say you. [This, that these proviso's are to be understood, appeares by the like phrase or manner of expression frequently used in other Scriptures.] By your leave the like phrase, or manner of expression, be it used as frequently as you will have it, in *other* Scriptures, doth not make it appear, that such proviso's must be understood *in this*; they conclude no more but this, that therefore *possibly they may be so understood in this*. But these Texts, of 1 *Sam.* 2. 30. and 1 Sam. 13. 13. have been examined already, and found to give in no evidence for you at all. I referre the Reader to my answer to your *Chap.* 2. *Sect.* 14.

So likewise for that of *Acts* 27. 24. the Reader may please to have recourse to my answer to your *Chap.* 13. *Sect.* 8.

So also for that of *Jonah* 3. 4. *vid.* my answer to *Cap.* 2. *Sect.* 14. this Text hath been sifted, nor will it quit cost to call them to a new trial.

Only I shall consider what you say in general, [that most frequently the purpose and decree of God, concerning the punishment of wicked and ungodly men, is expressed by the Holy Ghost absolutely and assertively, without the least mention of any condition of relaxation, or reversal; see the Texts cited in the Margin; yet from other passages of Scripture it is fully evident, that this Decree of his is conditional, in such a sense which imports a non-execution of the punishment herein decreed, upon the Repentance of the persons against whom the Decree is bent.]

Hitherto I yield you are right; but when you adde, [in like manner, though the purpose and decree of God for the justification of those who are called, and so the glorifying of those that shall be justified, be in the Scripture in hand delivered in an absolute and unconditioned forme of words; yet is it no wayes necessary to suppose, that therefore these Decrees must needs bring forth against all possible interveniences whatsoever; so that he that is *called*, must needs be *justified*, whether he truly *believeth* or *no*; and he that is *justified*, must needs be *glorified*, whether he *persevereth*, or *no*.]

I answer, 1. That we never said, *He that is called, must be justified, whether he believeth, or no*; or *he that is justified, must needs be glorified, whether he persevereth, or no*; there you abuse us; We say this, that *He who is called according to the purpose of God, shall believe*, and *so be justified*; and *he who is justified, shall persevere, and so be glorified; and that God hath engaged himself, to make him both a Believer; and a perseverer,*

severer, all possible interveniences whatsoever, notwithstanding.

Secondly, that there is an apparent difference, between Gods *threatnings* of *wicked men*, and his *decrees* of *saving his Elect*. Though those *threatnings* be *conditional*, and so also are his *promises*; yet his *decrees* of *saving his Elect*, are *without a condition*, referring it to *his decrees*, though not to the *saving of his Elect*; and that *his decree of saving his Elect upon such conditions*, carries in it *a decree of working these conditions in his Elect*, as *meanes* whereby he will accomplish their *salvation* as the *end*. His *threatnings of wicked men*, are meanes whereby he hath appointed to bring *many of them*, as many of them as are *Elect*, to *repentance*, and so to *salvation*.

And therefore though the *threatning* do not alwayes *expresse*; yet it alwayes *implieth* an exception, in *case of Repentance*; but his *Decree to save his Elect*, carries nothing in it that may leave it *reversible*, seeing whatever can be pretended in this kinde, God hath decreed, and that *irreversibly, to overthrow it*.

Thirdly, whereas you tell us in a Parenthesis, [that the familiar, frequent and accustomed expression of Scripture in such cases, exempts us from a necessity of construing this Decree, as if it must needs bring forth against any possible interveniences whatsoever;] I will not put you in minde of what you have sometimes yielded, of Gods Decrees, that they *do* so, in opposition to his *intentions*, which *do not* with you alwayes *bring forth* with such *infallibility*. You make the Decree before us, to be onely a *generall one*, and such as must in your sense *bring forth*, albeit it prove never so *barren*; but I shall remember you, that here upon the place, the Apostle goes about to take off all conceit, that men may be apt to entertain, of such a miscarrying of the wombe of this Decree; and to this purpose,

1. He askes in a way of triumph, *If God be for us, who can be against us?* in generall.

Then, 2. *Who shall lay any thing to our charge?* then onward, *Shall life, or death, &c. what shall separate us from the love of God?* Whether he understand *our love to God*, or *Gods love to us*; it is a strong asserting of the infallible effectualnesse of this Decree; or if perhaps no lesse then *both*, then here is infallibility upon infallibity.

Talke *you* of [*interveniences possible,*] saith the Apostle, *All things*, of which those [*interveniences*] make a part, *shall work together for our good*; and be your [interveniences,] what they will or can; *In all these*, saith he, *We are more then conquerours*. Shortly, the Apostle here expresly insists on the power, and providence of God overswaying all things; so as to make them, though contrary to the ends both of the actors, and actions, *operum, & operantium*, to advance his glorious designes for the salvation of his chosen, even when they most insolently, and industriously exalt themselves against them.

This which I have already said, will make it appear needless to the Reader, for me to trouble him with a new answer to the greatest part of your present Paragraph, wherein you only vapour, [that neither this Scripture, nor any other hath any thing in it which may be alledged for proof, *That such as are called*, you must mean in the sense of the Apostle upon the place, *must needs believe*, or *that he that believes, must needs persevere.*] I am unwilling to trouble the Reader with Repetitions, and onely say thus: That if your actings were answerable to your swaggerings; of all the men that I have been so happy as to be acquainted with, you best deserve, as aged as you are, to be chief *Squire* of *the Body*, to the *Knight of the Sunne*; but let us see what beames of light are darted forth by yout second Demonstratio, which is by this §. 44.

2. Reason, [If the Apostle should frame this Series, or chaine of Divine acts, with an intent to shew, or teach the uninterruptibleness of it in what case, or cases soever, he should fight against his general and maine scope, or designe in that part of the Chapter, which lies from about *vers.* the 17. to the end; which clearly is this, to exhort, strengthen, and encourage them to suffering afflictions.] And is an *assurance* given them of a *crown in heaven*, apt to *affright* them, think you, from bear-

ing the *Croſſe on earth?* or is an *aſſurance* given them of being *more then conquerours*, apt to *coole their courage*, and make them ſneak out of the field, like ſo many *cowards?* is an *aſſurance* of the *uninterruptibleneſſe of this chaine of divine Acts*, likely to make them *break out* of the *chaine of their ſufferings?* or is the *aſcertaining* of *glory in heaven* of ſuch tendency, and import, as to incline them to be *aſhamed of their profeſſion on earth?* and is the *ſecuring of* them that they ſhall *ſtand*, of ſuch a calculation as to tempt them to *run away?* Yes, it ſeems by what we may have the good luck to learne from Mr. *Goodwin*.

For ſay you, [To ſuggeſt any ſuch thing to them, as that being *called* and *juſtified*, nothing could poſſibly interpoſe to hinder them from being *glorified*; was to furniſh them with a plain motive, or ground, on which to neglect his exhortation in that kinde.] As for inſtance, you ſhould have added to convince them, they ſhould *get by their ſufferings* more then they could poſſibly imagine; was to furniſh them with a ground upon which they could not at any rate *endure any ſufferings*; not the *leaſt ſufferings* which were like to be of ſuch dangerous conſequence, as to bring them a *certaine glory of the greateſt magnitude*; the *weight of this glory* was able to *ſinke down their ſpirits*, nor could they poſſibly *hold* up their *heads*, being ſure to be overloaden with ſo *maſſie a Crown*.

The Apoſtle had moſt miſerably forgotten himſelf, if being to *encourage* men to *ſuffer*, he ſhould let fall ſuch an unſeaſonable word as this, that their *ſhort ſuffering* ſhould be ſure to come to ſo miſchievous an end, as *everlaſting joy*.

No, if he would have ſpoken like a man, and have indeed *encouraged* them to *ſuffer*, he ſhould have ſhewed his skill in repreſenting the *foreſt ſufferings*, ſo rarely *amiable*, as to have made them in *love with miſery on earth*, though to be *ſeconded* perhaps with *torments in hell*. He ſhould have told them that it was a *low-ſpirited thing* to *ſuffer*, when they were *ſure to be rewarded for it*.

What was it to *loſe*, where they might not doubt but their *loſſe* would be a *gaine?* or what to be *baniſhed* from their *countrey*, where they were *ſure* they ſhould come to *a City and Kingdome that cannot be ſhaken*? what, to be *perſecuted by men*, when they were *ſure* to be *ſupported by God*? Alas, this is not Heroical enough for Saints of a right *maſculine*, and generous ſpirit; it is true, Chriſt *deſpiſed the ſhame*, *and endured the Croſſe for the glory that was ſet before him*; but what is it for *Diſciples* to be *but as their Maſter? celeríque magiſtrum prævenit ingenio.* The ſuggeſtion of ſuch a thought as this, that they were *ſure to be glorified*, was enough to appale the face of a Martyr; and furniſheth him with a [plaine ground, *whereon* to neglect the Apoſtles exhortation,] to *ſuffer with patience*.

For as you rightly aske, [Who will be perſwaded to ſuffer tribulation, or things grievous to be endured, for the obtaining of that which they have ſufficient aſſurance given them that they ſhall obtaine, whether they ſuffer or no?] Where, I beſeech you, had you this newes? It is the firſt time, I, or any of my brethren met with it from any conſiderable hand; We were told all along, and accordingly with ſufficient confidence have told others, that the Apoſtle aſſured no man of coming to heaven by any other way then *many a Croſſe lane*, where we meet with a *Croſſe* at every *turne*, and that as much as the *two old* Croſſes at *Charing* and *Cheapſide* are demoliſhed, there will be *new ones* erected, and by men too, not much devoted to *ſuperſtition*, in every corner, where we can hope to go hide our heads. The Apoſtle never aſſured *us*, nor did *we* take upon us to aſſure others, of ever going to heaven without a *Croſſe*, unleſſe perhaps it be in our *pockets*, where we may in good time be happily eaſed of all ſuch inſupportable *burthens*.

I had almoſt ſaid, I was quite aſhamed to hear ſuch ſtuffe as this from learned Mr. *Goodwin* who is pleaſed to conclude; [Therefore certainly the Apoſtle did not intend here, to teach the certainty of Perſeverance, in thoſe which are once juſtified, unto ſalvation, againſt all carriages, and miſcarriages of theſe perſons whatſoever.] Mend it I pray in your next Edition, and let it be *in all carriages and miſcarriages whatſoever*, which will ſignifie very *little*; but as your words run, they

ſignifie

ſignifie *nothing*. The Apoſtle did intend here, to teach the certainty of Perſeverance, in thoſe perſons which are juſtified, unto ſalvation; ſo as they ſhould *not fall*, or, at leaſt, *not lie for ever* in any wilful and pernicious *miſcarriages*. I come now to your

3. Reaſon, whereby you demonſtrate the ſame thing yet further.

[If God ſhould juſtifie all, without exception, whom he calleth;] I pray adde, *effectually by his Spirit*, [and that againſt all barres of all unbelief, and wickedneſſe whatſoever; then might ungodly, and unblieving perſons inherit the Kingdome of God, and of Chriſt: But the Scripture ſpeaks aloud the impoſſibility, or at leaſt the non-futurity thereof: *Ergo.*]

I anſwer, whomſoever he *calleth* in this ſenſe by *his Spirit effectually working upon their hearts*, he makes *Believers*, and *godly*; and therefore your *Ergo* weighes no more then the Shepherds *Largo*, or *Tarboxe*, and proceeds upon a moſt miſerable miſtake. Well, but you have a reply at hand:

§. 45. [*Judas*, *Demas*, *Simon Magus* and others (ſay you) were called, in the ſenſe of the calling here meant; and yet laid ſuch barres as we ſpeak of in the way, by which their juſtification, at leaſt their final juſtification, was obſtructed, and prevented.] That they were called in the ſenſe we ſpeak of, (what yours is, I know not,) is denied.

And, 1. It is not enough for you to ſay, [It hath not been proved, nor ever will be by any man, that the calling here ſpoken of, imports any ſuch act of God, whereby the called are irreſiſtibly neceſſitated ſavingly to believe.] You know *this* is *that* our men *generally plead for*; and I may as well ſay, you have *not diſproved* it, as you, that [they neither have, nor will ever prove it.]

And, 2. When you liberally granting, [that it may import ſuch an act of God,] ſay, [It doth not prove though, but that their final juſtification, and conſequently glorification might be prevented:] We reply, The *ſame power* which was able *irreſiſtibly to convert*, was much *better* able to *confirm* them; and that God hath engaged it for this purpoſe.

Whatever *Chryſoſtomes* collection were, ſure we are, Chriſt called *Judas* a Devil long before.

§. 46. [But ſome, (ſay you) it may be, will yet further object againſt the Interpretation given, and plead,

1. That the connexion between theſe two linkes of this chaine, *predeſtination to a conformity with Chriſt*, and *calling*, are ſimply and abſolutely indiſſoluble; ſo that for example, whoſoever is thus *predeſtinated* by God, never failes of being *called* by him.

2. That it is altogether unlikely, that in one and the ſame Series, or concatenation of divine Actions, there ſhould not be the ſame fixedneſſe, or certainty of coherence between all the particulars; ſo that for example, there ſhould not be as much certainty, that he that is *called*, ſhall be juſtified; and again, that he that is *juſtified*, ſhall be *glorified*; as there is, that he that is *predeſtinated*, ſhall be *called*. To this you anſwer,

Firſt, by a Demurrer upon the former of theſe pleas; ſomewhat doubtful it is to you, whether a perſon; who by meanes of the love of God, which is in him at preſent, falls under his Decree of *predeſtination*, and conſequently by vertue of this Decree, is *predeſtinated to be conformed to the image of Chriſt*, may not poſſibly before the time appointed by God for his *calling*, be changed in that his affection, and conſequently paſſe from under that Decree of *Predeſtination*, and fall under another Decree of GOD oppoſite thereunto, and ſo never come to be called.]

Here I obſerve. 1. That you put *mans love to GOD* before *Gods calling of man*. It ſeemes with you, *man loves GOD firſt*, contrary to the Apoſtle.

2. That you put *mans love of God* before *Gods predeſtinating of man*; though we

poor men take *mans love to God* to be but in *time*; *Gods predestination of man* from *eternity*.

For in one and the same concatenation of Divine Acts, all decreed by him, there is not the same aspect, or relation, I mean, in point of necessity, and contingency between every former act, and that which followeth.

As for example the second Act of the foure now mentioned, may partly by *reason* of the tenour of the Decree, by which it was decreed by God; partly by reason of the nature of it, I mean, in reference to some divine projection, or end, have an absolute, and uninterruptible dependance upon, or connexion with the first; so that in case God creates a man, he is absolute, and against all interveniences whatsoever, resolved to conferre upon him that sufficiency of power, which was mentioned: Neither man himself, Angel, or Devil, could prevent, or hinder God from conferring such an endowment upon man, being created by him.

But it doth not follow from hence, that there must needs be the like aspect of necessity between this second Act and the third; or between the third and the fourth. For though God decreed as well the third Act as the second, *viz.* to bestow upon his creature man a sufficiency of power and meanes whereby to improve his first Being into a better; yet he did not Decree it, *i.e.* the doing of it, simply, and absolutely; but only provisionally, and upon the supposal of such an interveniency, one or more, which very possibly might not have intervened; as, *viz.* either the fall of this creature Man, by sin, and the gift of Jesus Christ upon it to die for his Redemption, or else the continuance of man for a time in the honour of his Creation, and intirenesse of his obedience unto God]

That in the same concatenation of divine Acts, the aspect, manner or kinde of dependance between Act and Act, may varie *according to their different* natures, I yield; but according [to the tenor of the divine Decree.] I deny; according to *their nature* they may varie, some being *necessary*, others *contingent* in *themselves*; according *to the tenor of the divine Decree* they do not varie; for that supposed to be, *all are necessary to be*; and that supposed not to be, *all are impossible*; so farre are any of them from being as much as *contingent*.

If God have decreed to act thus or thus, those acts, be they never so *contingent of themselves*, are now *necessarily to be*, though they *be never necessary*.

If God have decreed *not to act*, this *act*, be it looked upon as never so *necessary*, is so farre from being *contingent*, that it *cannot be at all*.

This appeares hence, Gods Decrees must needs be *effected*; *Ergo* the *acts* decreed by him, though never so *contingent* of *themselves*, are now *necessarily to be*; yet are they not made *to be necessary*, by that Decree; because *necessity of being* is *intrinsecall*, the *Decree* is *extrinsecal* to the *nature of the acts*; and albeit it inferre the *futurition of the acts*, yet *but a futurition according to the nature of the acts*; And the *nature of the acts is such*, that *without such a Decree* they can *never be brought forth*.

For instance, God decreed to create the world; therefore was the world *necessarily to be created*, yet was not the world *created necessarily*; for the world was *necessarily to be created*, or else Gods *Decree had miscarried*; the world was not *created necessarily*, for Gods *will* only *led him to create the world*; and if he *would not have created the world*, as *he was not bound to create it*, the *world had not*, *could not have been created*; it *had not been created*, for it was his *will alone* that imployed his *power* in creating it; it *could not have been created*, because albeit the *power* of God be precedaneous to his *will*, *in signo rationis* to *create it*, *creation* not implying *contradiction* falls within compasse of it; yet had not the *power of God* any way to act, but in subordination to his *will*; and so if he *had not willed to* create the world, the *world could not have been created*; The creation had been *possible*; *quoad esse*, it had been *impossible* in regard of *existere*. God *could have created the world*, though he had *not willed to create it* in *sensu diviso*, in *sensu composito* he could not; the *creation of the World had* not been *impossible*, it *could not* have been *actuall*. There is then a necessity, that whatever act *God decrees*, *should be*, be it never so *contingent* in its own

own *nature*; and that it ſhould *neceſſarily be*, in the forme and manner God hath decreed; yea, there is *no act ſo neceſſary*, but that it depends on the *free will of God* for its *exiſtence*; and in this reſpect, as *every act which he wills*, is *neceſſarily to be* by reaſon of *his will*; ſo *no act* is *neceſſarily to be*; but hath its being meerly from *Gods will*; and that ſuppoſed *not to be*, it is *impoſſible* any act ſhould *be*. So then in reſpect of *Gods decree*, [the aſpect, and manner, or kinde of dependance, between act and act,] cannot varie, albeit in reſpect of their *owne natures* they may.

Secondly, But now, it is one thing to ſpeak of the acts, which are meerly Gods; and the acts which are ſo *Gods*, that they are the *creatures acts alſo*: For albeit the *acts of God*, which are the *creatures acts alſo*, may be ſtiled ſome *contingent*, others *neceſſary*, as to the *nature of the creature*; yet the *acts* which are *meerly Gods upon the creature*, which is *paſſive*, no way *active* in them, are all of one and the ſame nature; and are in *themſelves* alike *contingent*, and in reſpect of the *Decree of God* alike *neceſſary*. In themſelves alike *contigent*, for they all depend alike upon the *free will* and *pleaſure* of God; without which neither of them could have been more then other, and *nothing was capable* of *moving the will of God*, that he ſhould give Being to *one* more then the *other*; in reſpect of *Gods Decree* alike *neceſſary*, for the *Decree of God* is *unalterable* in *all things*, and that *alike*; for albeit he *decree things*, whereof *ſome* are more *unalterable* then *others* in their own *nature*; yet theſe *decrees* themſelves of all are *equally unchangable*, even when he *decrees changes*, his *decrees* admit *none*.

Thirdly, Gods *Calling*, *Juſtifying*, *Glorifying*, are all acts purely *his own*, no way the *creatures*; and conſequently theſe all proceed *alike* from his *will*, and meerly from *that*; and why he ſhould *more neceſſarily call* then *juſtifie*, or *juſtifie* then *glorifie*, cannot be ſhewed. Nay, his *glorifying*, being the *laſt in execution*, is to be acknowledged the *firſt in intention*; and ſo, if I may ſo ſpeak, decreed of the two, rather *more* then *either of the others*. For the *others* are to be conceived, as decreed *in order to this*; *juſtifying* in order to *glorifying*, *calling* in order to *juſtifying*; and ſo the *latter*, though it be to be *acted after* the *former*, yet was rather *decreed before it*; and the *laſt* (as I may ſay) was more *immediately* decreed then the *firſt*.

This being rightly weighed, it will uppeare, that there is not a *greater contingency* of the *latter*, then of the *former*, as you pretend, but rather *è contrario*.

Fourthly, As for the inſtance which you give, to ſhew a different aſpect, or dependance between divine acts, and acts decreed in the ſame concatenation.

1. Even theſe acts, are all *alike neceſſary* in order to Gods decree. As God *decreeing to create a man*, and *give him being*, [*Gods giving him being*,] is, you confeſſe, *neceſſary*; and ſo is [Gods *giving him a power, or meanes ſufficient to preſerve this being given unto him*. [But I hope both are *neceſſary*, only in reſpect of *Gods Decree*, not their *own nature*. For, that man ſhould have a being from God, or that having being, he ſhould have ſufficiency of meanes, or power to preſerve his being, cannot be pretended to be *neceſſary* upon any other account. Now in reſpect of the ſame *Decree of God*, it was *as neceſſary* man ſhould have a ſufficiency.

2. I deſire to know, whether God, if he *do call the man*, did *decree to call him, or not*; if he *do not call him*, whether he *decree not to call him or not?* if you ſay, *he calls the man without decreeing it*, you make God to *act* without *purpoſing to act*; if you ſay *he did decree to call him*, I aske, *whether he did decree it from eternity, or not?* if *not from eternity*, then *he decrees after it*; and a *new decree* puts a *change in God*; if *from eternity he decreed to call him*, I demand, did God *foreknow the man would ceaſe to love him, or not?* if he *did not foreknow it*, he was not Omniſcient; if he *did foreknow it*, what an *impertinent decree* was this, *to decree that to a man which he knew the man would not be capable of receiving*; and that *which God accordingly would not do for him*, viz. *not call him?*

Now further upon a ſuppoſition, *that God doth not call the man*; either *God decreed*

not

not to call him, or elſe *decreed not, not to call him*; If you ſay, *God decreed not, not to call him*, then *God decreed to call him*, and *yet called him not*, contrary to his *decree*; If you ſay *God decreed not to call him*, then I demand, *paſſed he this decree from eternity, or no?* if *not from eternity*, then you put a *new decree upon God*; if *from eternity*, then *from eternity God decreed not to call the man*; and conſequently *the man was never under a decree of predeſtination to be conformed to the image of Chriſt*, and conſequently did not [paſſe from under that Decree of predeſtination, and fall under another Decree of God, oppoſite thereunto.]

I ſhall be glad to ſee how Mr. *Goodwin* will ſteer his courſe between theſe Rockes; I doubt that *Incidet in ſcyllam, cupiens vitare Charybdin.*

If he ſhall ſay, *God did decree to call the man, upon condition the man continued to love him*; then beſides that he makes the *mans love of God, precedaneous to Gods calling of the man*, the argument will returne thus; then God decreed not the *calling of the man*, more then the *non-calling of the man*; for if he decreed *to call him upon condtion of his continuance in the love of God*, and *not to call him in caſe of his diſcontinuance in that love*; this *continuance*, or *diſcontinuance* being *equally contingent*, God decreed *to call him*, and *not call him* alike; and ſo the man did not [paſſe from under *one decree*, to be under *another*,] but was *never under one decree* more then *another*; for *bearing love to God*, he was not *under the decree of calling*, unleſſe he *continued in that love*, and *bearing no love* to God, unleſſe he continued in that *non-loving of God*, he was not under a Decree of *non-calling*.

Minutis diſſecet hæc ambagibus.

2. [To the latter of the ſaid pleas, you anſwer, by denying the (*A.*) unlikelihood therein aſſerted. For in (*B.*) one, and the ſame concatenation of divine acts, the aſpect, and manner, or kinde of dependance between act and act, may vary according to their different (*C.*) natures, or the different (*D.*) tenor of Gods Decrees concerning them. As for example, (*E.*) God may decree, to create or give being unto a man: Again, he may decree to give unto this man a ſufficiency of meanes, or power whereby to maintain himſelf in this being given unto him. Again, yet further he may decree to give unto this man; not only a ſufficiency of meanes, and power to make good his poſſeſſion of that being, thus given him; but further to improve his preſent being firſt given him, into a better and more deſirable being: Further, he may decree to promote and advance the condition of this his creature man, above the line of his firſt Being, being of power, not onely to maintaine the poſſeſſion of his preſent Being; but further to improve his preſent Being firſt given unto him, to a better, and more deſirable Being; and laſtly, that accordingly he ſhould have that more deſirable Being alſo. For however you are pleaſed to ſpeak, as if [though God decreed as well the third act, as the ſecond, *viz.* to beſtow upon his creature man a ſufficiency of Power, and meanes; whereby to improve his firſt Being into a better; yet he did not decree it, *i. e.* the doing of it, ſimply, and abſolutely; but only proviſionally, and upon the ſuppoſall of ſuch an interveniency, one or more, which very poſſibly might not have intervened, as, *viz.* either the fall of this creature by ſin, and the gift of Jeſus Chriſt upon it, to die for his Redemption, or elſe the continuance of man for a time in the honour of his creation, and intireneſſe of his obedience unto God.] Yet I muſt tell you,

1. That God did decree to beſtow upon man this power and meanes, whereby to improve his firſt being into a better *ſimply* and *abſolutely*. It is one thing to ſpeak of *mans improving his firſt being into a better*, which I confeſſe requires a *condition on mans part*, another to ſpeak of *Gods beſtowing this power upon him*, which requires, I trow, *no condition on Gods part*; nay, *no condition on mans part* was required to *Gods beſtowing this power upon him*. He gave him, I hope, this power in the very *firſt moment* he made him.

2. That

2. That God did not only not decree to give him *this power*; but not as much as to give him that bettering of his Being (you ſpeak of) upon ſuch conditions, as you mention.

For I beſeech you, if God decreed to give him this, [either upon his fall, or upon his ſtanding,] as you ſpeak, then ſure he decreed to give it him *without condition*, it being *indifferent* whether he *ſtood* or *fell*, as to this *better being*; for God (accotding to you) decreed it to him upon *either*; and therefore, ſay I, *abſolutely* and without *condition*; as he that decrees to beſtow a thing upon me, whether I *do my duty*, or *do not do it*, decrees *abſolutely* to beſtow it upon me.

3. If you ſay, God decreed it not abſolutely, then I aske, to which condition he reſtrained it? if to [*mans ſtanding in the honour of his creation, and due obedience*,] then that condition not being performed on *mans part*, God ſhould not have beſtowed a better being upon him, without *croſſing his decree*; wherein he ordained to beſtow it upon him, only upon *condition of ſuch his ſtanding*. If to [*mans falling*, and *the gift of Jeſus Chriſt*,] then had man *kept his ſtanding*, God had *not beſtowed a better being upon him*: For he decreed to beſtow it upon him, only [upon caſe of his falling, and the gift of Jeſus Chriſt.]

4. When, I beſeech you, did God decree the gift of Jeſus Chriſt? *before* he ſaw mans fall, or after? If *before*, then he decreed it to man, while yet *man had no need of it* in his eyes; if *after*, then I demand, whether the other decree *ſtanding or not?* he could not the *other decree ſtanding*: for the decree of the gift of Jeſus Chriſt, ſuppoſeth man *fallen in Gods eyes*. And then to what purpoſe ſhould [God decree him a better being upon continuance of his ſtanding,] from which he was already *fallen?* If he did decree it, *the other decree not ſtanding*, then either not ſtanding *negatively*, or *privatively*; if *privatively*, then the *other decree fell*, which how it ſtands with the *immutability* of God, only ſuch wits as Mr. *Goodwins* can apprehend; if *negatively*, then the other decree did *never ſtand*, i. e. was *never made*, *never was*. Into what pretty miſmazes do the capricious wits of men runne themſelves, when they will be ſo forward, as to trace the decrees of God? and how deſperately do they intangle themſelves, while they will adventure to unfold them?

5. It remaines therefore, that *God did not decree to give man a better being upon condition of his ſtanding*, ſave only in this ſenſe, that he *decreed mans ſtanding ſhould be the condition whereon man ſhould expect a better being*, and *ſhould accordingly have received it, had he performed that condition*; but he *decreed to give man a better being, notwithſtanding mans not ſtanding, by the Redemption of Jeſus Chriſt.*

It is one thing, *to decree man ſhould have a better being upon condition of his ſtanding*, which implies a decree of *mans ſtanding*, and *his better being thereupon*; another *to decree mans better being ſhould be upon condition of his ſtanding*, which implies *no decree of either* the one or the other, but only *that he ſhould not have the one without the other.*

The *glorifying* of all that are, or ſhall be glorified, God decreed, I grant, ſo as that it ſhould be *upon condition*; but then he decreed the *being of that very condition*, and that in *order* to, or as a *meanes* of *their glorifying*; their *juſtifying* in order to their *glorifying*, their *calling* in order to their *juſtifying*; and thus the *latter*, which you make *leaſt neceſſary*, is *ſo neceſſary*, that *all the former* are ordered meerly in *relation unto it.* But I ſhall conſider what you ſay onward.

[1. That the fall of man was contingent, there being no cauſe either within him, or without him, neceſſitating him hereunto, is unqueſtionable; (that the foreknowledge of God did no wayes prejudice, or hinder the contingency of it, hath been formerly ſhewed.)

2. That the gift of Jeſus Chriſt, to die for the Redemption of man, depended in this ſenſe upon his fall; ſo as that he ſhould not have been given in ſuch a way, or upon ſuch termes, I mean to die, had not man fallen, is, I ſuppoſe, the ſenſe and apprehenſion of every man.

3. That, that act of God, in giving unto man, power, meanes, and opportunity

to better himself in point of condition, above the line of his Creation, or first Being, depends (his fall supposed, which was contingent also, as was lately said) upon the gift of Jesus Christ, so as never to have taken place, in case he had not been so given, is sufficiently evident without proof,; so that evident it is, that this act of God hath only an accidental, or contingent dependency upon, or coherence with the former; whereas this former hath an essentiall, and necessary connexion with the first, as hath been shewed.]

I answer, 1. That the fall of man was contingent, and that the foreknowledge of God did no way hinder, or prejudice the contingency thereof, is yielded: But that this contingency, without prejudice to it, was determined by Gods decree to permit man to fall, which decree supposed, man albeit he had a power, could not reduce that power into act, is not only mine, but the assertion of great Authors.

2. That the gift of Jesus Christ depended upon mans fall, is yielded; and more, that God decreed to send him to die, upon the fall of man, referring these last words to *to die*; or to *to send him to die*, not *to God decreed*: But notwithstanding, the death of Christ was absolutely determined by God; and howbeit the sending of Christ, were in order of *execution* depending upon the fall of man; yet of the two, it is more rationall to say, the sending of Jesus Christ, was in order of *intention* before the fall of man; and that God *decreed* to *permit man to fall*, that he might magnifie his *mercy*, and other *glorious* excellencies in Christ, rather then that he *first decreed to permit man to fall*, and then *afterward* to *send Christ to die for him*. The *glory of God* being the *ultimate end*, whatever is *neerer to that*, as the *meanes*, hath a relation somewhat like that of an *end* to *that* which is *further off*; and thus the *death of Christ*, was not more in dependance *upon the fall of man*, then the *permission of the fall of man* was *upon the death of Christ*. The *fall of man* gave *occasion* for the *death of Christ*, and thus the *death of Christ* depended on the *fall of man*; the *death of Christ* was *that* wherein the *glory of Gods justice* and *mercy*, was admirably *demonstrated*; and thus *the fall of man* may be said to have been *permitted* for the *manifestation* of *Gods glory*, as *causa sine qua non* it could not have been.

But consider the decree of God *as one* and *the same* in *it self*, albeit it take in *both these objects*, and the one and the other, whatever *relation* they have between *themselves*, and whatever be the *contingency* of their own *natures*, will be found to have *alike infallibly* and *unalterably come to passe*.

3. And now, what though [the giving of this power, meanes, and opportunity to man, to better himself in point of condition above the line of his Creation, or first Being, depend, his fall supposed, upon the gift of Jesus Christ?] The *gift of Jesus Christ* being, as hath been said, *decreed infallibly to come to passe*, so was *this power to be given to all such as have it*.

And further, what if [Jesus Christ were given them for this end, that they might have power *to become the sons of God*?] then their having *power to become the sons of God* seemes *first in intention* before the *giving of Jesus Christ*, as the *end* hereof; and the *giving of Jesus Christ after* it, as the *meanes*. Here is then nothing said hitherto, to shew any such [difference of aspect, manner, or kinde of dependance between divine acts, in one and the same concatenation of them.] And so yet, all the acts in the chaine before us, *calling*, *justifying*, *glorifying*, are *decreed alike infallibly to come to passe*; and that which *you* make *least*, is *most especially* to be acknowledged, such as being *principally intended*.

Now go on. [There is the same consideration between the third and fourth, or last of these Acts. For God upon his Decree to grant unto his Creature man, a sufficiency of means, and opportunity to promote in his way, *viz.* by higher services, and greater acts of obedience, his happinesse above the condition of his Creation, or first Being; might, and did decree also himself to promote in his way, *viz.* by the ingagement of his power, his Creatures happinesse accordingly. But this latter Act of his, though decreed by him, doth not import an absolute necessity of per-

performance by him; but only a conditional, and contingent. The tenor of that decree of his, wherein this Act is decreed, being only this: In caſe my Creature man, ſhall quit himſelf in any meaſure worthy that grace, which I ſhall give unto him, in, and through my Son Chriſt, I will make him greater in happineſſe, then he was in the ſtate of his Creation.]

Thus you are pleaſed to repreſent the caſe; but by your good leave, *mans happineſs* is the *firſt* in Gods *intention*, and Gods *imploying of his power* the *next*, though in the way of *execution* the order be *contrary*.

Now further, God imploy es his power, and therefore ſo decreed, not only to give man *happineſſe* upon condition of his *obedience*, but alſo to give him *obedience* in order to *happineſſe*. Nor is the tenor of Gods *Decree*, as you propoſe it, [In caſe man ſhall do this, I will make him thus happy;] that, I confeſſe, is the tenor of Gods *promiſe*; but, *I will aſſiſt him to do this his duty*, and *afterwards reward him*, or rather, *that I may reward him* with *happineſſe*, *I will inable him to do his duty*. Still the *acts* which God *decrees*, though they have the relation of a *means*, and *end*, *one* to *another*, yet are *both alike neceſſary* in reference to Gods *decree*; and *that* act which you make moſt *contingent*, is *principally intended*, and accordingly as *ſurely performed*; and the *other* act is intended *for this*, and ſo not altogether *ſo much as this*, rather then any way *leſſe*.

And thus it is in the linke of Acts now under conſideration, *juſtifying* is as the *end* of *calling*, *glorifying* both of *juſtifying* and *calling*; and conſequently *glorifying* is *firſt* in *intention*, and accordingly in reference to Gods decree, no leſſe *neceſſarily accompliſhed* then *calling* it ſelf; albeit it be not accompliſhed, but *upon calling*, and *juſtifying*; but God *decreed* theſe *means* for that *end* from all *eternity*, and doth in *time effect* them for that *end*, and that *end by theſe means*, and all *alike certainly*. And thus notwithſtanding all your endeavours to break it, every linke in this chaine hangs as faſt as the other. Nor are [both the feet of this objection ſo weak, and lame,] but that it ſtands firme enough upon *either*, after all your thruſting both with hand and foot to overthrow it.

Státque ut dura ſilex, aut ut Marpeſia cautes.

§. 47. You deal with another objection, [colourable, as you ſuppoſe, in ſome mens eyes] againſt your interpretation; and the ſubſtance of it, you give thus: [*If the linke of that chaine of Divine Acts deſcribed in this Scripture, may be broken by the miſcarriages of the Saints in any kind, then had the Apoſtle no ſufficient reaſon to build the Saints ſo high upon it, in confidence, exultations, and triumphs, as he doth in the verſes immediately following, What ſhall we ſay to theſe things? If God be for us, who can be againſt us? the reaſon is, becauſe the Saints are children of many infirmities, and of much unworthineſs, apt to ſin againſt God every moment. Therefore, if their peace and ſalvation depend upon their own regular, and worthy walkings with God, they are in a condition of no good ſecurity to be ſaved, and ſo have no ground to triumph at ſuch a rate.*

You anſwer, you have broken the heart of this objection in the former Chapter, and ſend your Reader to the 21. Section of it,] where belike he may ſee this objection lying ſprawling, gaſping, and giving up its ghoſt into the hands of your Anſwer.

But if the Reader have the patience to viſite my reply, he may chance to hear, yea, and ſee, that this [heart-broken-objection] hath recovered it ſelf, after all the death pulls, that your anſwer ſcared it into.

And indeed you ſeem to inſinuate a confeſſion of ſomewhat to this purpoſe, when you muſter up no leſſe then a ſquadron of young freſh Anſwers, to knock this [heart-broken-objection] on the very head. Well, we will ſee how valiantly they will kill that which was half dead before.

§. 48. The firſt ſets upon it thus, That we poor men, [the friends and favourers of the common interpretation,] grant, and teach; that the Saints themſelves cannot have

any peace, or comfort in their faith, or assurance of salvation, whiles they walk profanely, loosely, or unfaithfully with God. So that we our selves suspend the peace and comfort, and much more the joy and triumph of the faith of the Saints, upon their Christian behaviour, and regular walkings with God.] And therefore judging Mr. *Goodwins* Exposition upon such an account as this, sillie men [we condemne our selves and our own Doctrines.]

It is true, we [teach the Saints neither have, nor can have any peace or comfort in their faith, or assurance of salvation, whiles they walk profanely,] and that we [suspend their peace, and comfort upon their Christian behaviour, and walking with God.]

I take it, 1. This cleares us from the calumnies you throw upon our *Doctrine*, as if it bade men be *secure*, and enjoy themselves in *peace*, in the midst of all *licentiousnesse*, and *profanenesse*:

But, 2. How it convicts us, I understand not; Good Sir, we distinguish of this *suspending*, that we suspend either *immediately*, or *ultimately*; we indeed suspend the peace, comfort, joy, triumph of the Saints, *immediately* upon their regular walkings with God; but we suspend these *regular walkings with God*, and consequently *all which we suspend upon them*, upon *Gods gracious assistance and unchangeable decree to afford it*. We suspend their *peace and comfort, &c.* upon *their regular walkings*, as we do a *hat upon a pin*; but we suspend these *regular walkings*, upon *Gods assistance* and *decree to continue it*, as we fasten the *pin in the wall*. We suspend *their peace and comfort, &c.* upon *their regular walkings*, as we do somewhat which we *tie to a threed*, their *regular walkings* upon *Gods assistance*, and *decree to continue it*, as we do the *threed on a naile*; that *we suspend their comfort on their regular walkings*, is farre from proving we *suspend it not on a divine decree*; unlesse perhaps you can prove, that the *watch* which hangs in a *string tied to a girdle*, *hangs not on the girdle*, but meerly in the *string*.

Sir, the Objection of our forwardnesse to wander, our backwardnesse to returne, our weaknesse when we walk stronglieſt, our stumblings when we go steddilieſt, &c. is that, which you will not turne off so easily as you pretend. There is nothing can *fortifie* us against our own *weaknesse*, lesse then *Gods almightinesse*; nothing that can assure us against the *treachery* of our own *hearts*, but the *faithfulnesse of Gods promise*; nothing against the *slipperinesse* of our own *spirits*, but the *irremoveable fixednesse* of *Gods decrees*. Take away *his power*, which alone can keep us from running to all manner of excesse of riotous wickednesse, and superfluity of naughtinesse; his *promise*, which alone gives us hope he will imploy his *power* to keep us from such exorbitancies; His *decree*, whose unchangeablenesse only gives us assurance, that he will not faile to performe his *promise*, albeit we by our daily *provocations* give grounds enough for him to do it, without dishonour; but that though *we deny him*, *he cannot deny himself*, and farewell all peace, and comfort, that our regular walkings can give us. Nothing lesse then *Gods purpose* to preserve us *blameleſſe unto the day of our Lord Jesus Christ*, is able to support the *greatest Saint*, in his *exactest walkings*; as *fairly* as he *deports* himself to *day*, how *foully* may he *debauch* himself to *morrow*? yea, he who is more confident on *himself*?

Quem dies veniens videt superbum,
Hunc dies fugiens videt jacentem.

In short, *that man* doth not walke regularly enough, who thinks he can *go one step in his own strength*. And so it is *weakness* in your answer to dwaile so much of the *Saints own power*. Yet

2. Your next answer comes off couragiously, that [the assurance of the continuance of Gods love to them, and of his care over them, whiles they in any measure walk worthy of it, is a regular and due foundation unto the Saints, of every whit as great a confidence, exultation, and triumph, as the Apostle in the words mentioned entitles them unto.] They had need be very sure of their [walking worthy

worthy of Gods love and care over them in ſome meaſure] unto *the end*, that ſhall raiſe their ſpirits to ſo high a pin of confidence of Gods love and care over them, ſuſpended meerly upon their [*walking worthy of it*;] but the Saints reflecting upon their unworthy ſtraglings, and the fearful deſertions, whereof thoſe *unworthy* ſtraglings are too *worthy*, will hardly work their hearts to ſo ſublimate an exultation. Alas, how little while is Gods love to them like to continue, if it will ſtay no longer then till it be duly entertained with their *regular walking*? The Saints are wont of old to aſcribe their *regular walkings* to the *continuance of Gods love to them*, not *the continuance of Gods love to* their *regular walkings*. It may be it is their *modeſty* only that ſpeaks in ſuch a ſtraine of complement; they may, if Mr. *Goodwin* underſtand them, talke at another rate of ſelf-confidence: this is the tendency and import of this ſecond Anſwer.

3. The third advanceth yet more bravely thus, [The very particular, and expreſſe ground, upon which the Apoſtle buildeth up himſelf, and the Saints with him, in ſuch a triumphant confidence, as we heard, is this, the ſenſe, or aſſurance of Gods love toward them, meaning, whiles they walk with him as becometh Saints; not any aſſurance of the continuance of his love to them, how profane, wicked or abominable ſoever they can or ſhall be.] What a *ſudden rout* hath this anſwer made among a *troop* of *ſtraw*? Where are the men who ſay, [*God continueth his love to his Saints, how profane, or wicked, or abominable ſoever they either can, or ſhall be*; ſay rather, ſhall or can be?] We ſay, the greateſt Saints would without the continuance of Gods preſerving grace, which we are wont to look upon as a fruit of his love, be all as abominable as any other men; and that the *leaſt ſin* they can commit, is *abominable enough* to *deſerve* the with-drawing of Gods love. Only we adde, that *Gods love* is ſo *ſtable*, that *it keeps them from ſuch abominations* as are of a *viſible magnitude*; or if at any time he permit them to *fall*, to let them ſee whither their own hearts would carry them; yet he *raiſeth* them again, and ſhewes them that it is *he* whom they owe, for that they do not alwayes *lie on the ground*.

We ſay not, God *loves them, be they as wicked as they can be*; but that *God loves them ſo as to keep them from being ſo wicked as they would be*, and to make them *better* then otherwiſe they either *will* or *can be*.

This one miſrepreſentation of our Doctrine, hath eked out almoſt all the arguments in your diſcourſe. Now as hitherto you have made the *worſt* of our Doctrine: So

4. Your *laſt* Anſwer makes the *beſt* of *your own*. [Such a Suppoſition, or Doctrine as this, That they that are at preſent *juſtified*, may poſſibly ſin themſelves out of the grace of *Juſtification*, and ſo never come to be *glorified*; is upon due conſideration, no bridle at all to check the holy and humble confidence of the Saints, or their boaſtings in God, and in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt; yea, they may in the face of this truth, lift up themſelves upon the wings of a bleſſed ſecurity unto heaven, and rejoyce with that *joy which is unſpeakable, and glorious*.] You do but *ſay* this *here*, in your *laſt chapter* you *proved* it; let the Reader be pleaſed to examine how *ſtrenuouſly*; but I beſeech you, have not we allowed that the Saints have in *themſelves* an unhappy power [to ſin themſelves out of their Juſtification?] do we ſay more then this, that, *that unhappy power, is happily overpowered by the power of God*? take away this *overpowering power of God*, which you deny all along, (God forſooth cannot work at this rate without being injurious to his Creature Royal,) and what *heart* will any Saint have to look that *ſad Doctrine*, which you here preſent, in the *face*?

Obſtupuit, ſteteruntque comæ, vox faucibus hæſit.

§. 49. You are now ready to engage a new objection againſt your interpretation of the Text, *Rom.* 8. 28. againſt which you diſcover, [ſome apt to diſpute thus: *If this be Gods end or deſigne* in predeſtinating thoſe whom he foreknew to be conformed to the image of Chriſt, that *Chriſt might be the firſt-borne amongſt many Bre-*

thren, i. e. might have the honour of bringing many into part and fellowship with himself in his own bleſſedneſſe and glory, then muſt all they who are thus predeſtinated, of neceſſity attain, or come to enjoy ſuch a conformity with him; otherwiſe God ſhall be fruſtrated in his deſigne, and Jeſus Chriſt be defeated, and diſappointed of that excellent honour, which his Father projected for him. For if ſome, (ſay ſome) or but one thus predeſtinated may miſcarry, and never come to enjoy an actuall conformity unto him in his glory; why may not others of them miſcarry likewiſe, and conſequently all, and ſo the great project of God for the honour of his Son Jeſus Chriſt, be laid in the duſt?

To this you anſwer, 1. Suppoſe that Jeſus Chriſt ſhould have no Brethren conformable unto him in glory; yet would it not follow hence, that the deſigne of GOD, to make him *the firſt-borne among many Brethren*, ſhould be made void and miſcarry: For the deſigne of God in this behalf, ſtood mainly in this, *viz.* in caſting this honour upon Jeſus Chriſt, that he ſhould be a perſon every way fitted and accompliſhed, ſhould act and do, or be ready and willing to act and do every ſuch thing, whereby many of his Brethren, *i.e.* of the children of men, if they were not moſt ſhamefully and groſly neglective of themſelves and their own greateſt concernments, might come to partake with him in his great bleſſedneſſe and glory. And in caſe men ſhould neglect themſelves; yet the honour and glory of a ſignall Benefactor, and great Saviour, ſhall remaine entire unto him; nor is there the leaſt colour why he ſhould ſuffer the leaſt prejudice in the thoughts, either of men or Angels, becauſe of the wilful folly, and madneſſe of men, to *forſake their own mercies*, and deſtroy themſelves.]

This firſt part of your anſwer, undertakes to make good, [*Chriſt might be the firſt-borne among many Brethren, though he had never a one,*] which is as good as if I ſaid, Mr. *Goodwin* is the firſt among *many* learned Sophies, that full accord with him in this rare notion, though *no man elſe* be ſo wiſe as to apprehend it, much leſſe ſo valiant as to *maintain* it.

I confeſſe, Chriſt is ſaid to be *Maries firſt-borne*, albeit the conſtant tradition of the Church be, that ſhe never teemed with a *ſecond childe*, by an uſual Helleniſme, πρωτογενὴς, is equivalent to μονογενὴς: But how he ſhould be ſaid to be *the firſt borne among many Brethren*, ſuppoſe he had not as much as *one* brother; when Mr. *Goodwin* ſhall make it appear, I think he ſhall well deſerve to have for his reward, as much as will purchaſe all the inheritances of as many Gentlemen, as are the *Eldeſt* among *many Brethren*; provided their Parents had never more then *one childe*.

I remember it was uſual to diſtinguiſh between *Prioritas Cæſariana*, and *Pompeiana*, with alluſion to that of *Lucan*:

> *Nec quenquam jam ferre poteſt, Cæſárve priorem,*
> *Pompeiúſve parem.*

And ſo that which they called *Prioritas Pompeiana*, was that which admitted no *equal*; *Cæſariana*, that which had no *ſuperiour*. Mr. *Goodwin* ſhall be acknowledged *Prior* of the Religious houſe at *Wormes* in both reſpects, whenever he makes this clear, that he may be the *Eldeſt Brother* of all the *ſociety*, though there be never a *Fellow* of the Colledge beſides *himſelf*; that he may be the *firſt among many* of that ancient Foundation, though *no man* were found worthy to live with him under the ſame roof; but he have all the revenues left intirely, according to his ſingular merit in his own hand.

And truly, the rare Reaſon which you aſſigne for this your Reverend aſſertion, ſhewes there is no preferment in that kinde, that can be above the ſphere of your deſerts; [For the counſel and deſigne of God, in this behalf, ſtood mainly and principally in this, *viz.* in caſting this honour upon Jeſus, that he ſhould be a perſon, every wayes fitted and accompliſhed; ſhould act and do, and be ready and wil-

willing to act and do every such thing; *whereby many of his Brethren*, i.e. of the children of men, if they were not most shamefully and grossely neglective of themselves and their own greatest concernments, might come to partake with him in his great blessednesse and glory.] Why, but good Sir, 1. The Apostle is speaking of Gods designe *of his poor childrens happinesse, in order to the glory of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ*; not of his designe *of the glory of Jesus Christ in order to our happinesse*. He shewes how God decreed to *conforme us to the image of his Son*, that *he* might have the glory of being *the first-borne among many Brethren*; not how God decreed to *qualifie him*, so as to fit and accomplish him for bringing *us* to this height of happinesse. You take the businesse by the wrong end; *the honour of Jesus Christ* is here the *end*, as farre as falls under our Apostles consideration; and *our happinesse*, in being *conformed to him*, the *meanes*; and therefore *his being qualified to save us*, is not chiefly aimed at here; but *our being sanctified and glorified*, that *he* may be honoured *by us*.

I acknowledge in the order of nature, Christs *being qualified*, as you speak, is *before our Sanctification* and *Salvation*, as a *meanes* to it; but in the order of our Apostles *discourse*, our *Sanctification* and *Salvation* is *before Christs glory*, as *meanes* to it; for he speaks not here of glory conferred upon Christ, whereby *he* might be in a *capacity to save us*; but of *glory redounding to him* from his *actuall saving of us*, and in order to *this glory*; not only *his power to save us*, but *our being saved* by his power, have the relation of *meanes* to an *end*; and so though Christs glory be *first* in that order of that *causality*, which is called *finall*; yet in that order of that *causality*, which is called *efficient*, it is *last*, and depends upon our salvation.

2. What meane you to speak so much of [*Christs being qualified to act and do*,] and not let fall one poor word concerning his being qualified to *suffer*; which *suffering*, I think, did most of the *work*? Have you a conceit that the Apostle speakes of a *new Predestination* since Christs *sufferings* on the *Crosse*?

3. What is this that you talk of [*the children of men*, as of Christs *brethren*, upon that account?] Sir, the Apostle meanes only as *children of God*, and that GOD decreed to *regenerate* them, and to *preserve* them, is that which he here aimes at.

4. How highly do you consult the honour of Christ, in saying, [that he was qualified so as to conforme men to his image, if they would be content, and yield by their good will to be so conformed;] denying him a power of *over-ruling* their stubborne *hearts*, which you afterwards call, [saving them by head and shoulders?] Surely it is for Christs honour, that he plucks us all as *brands out of the fire*, and by a merciful resisting power, brings us from *darknesse to light*, and from the *power of Satan unto God*.

Lastly, if this were enough for the *honour* of Christ to save us, [if we will;] yet I trow, it is *more* for his honour to *bow our wills*, so as to yield to be saved; and it more shewes Gods love to *us*, and his *Son* Jesus Christ also, to give him a *power* not to be *checked*, then only such as may be *defeated* by our unworthy and desperate *forc saking our own mercies*.

And if you please to weigh the Scope of the Apostle, he subjoynes that, which clearly argues, he aimes at an indefesiable purpose of God, to procure this blessed effect to our good, and Christs glory. *If God be for us, who can be against us?* Belike, though *none else* can, yet we *our selves* may; and so sufficiently, that we need not the contribution of any other assistance, to enable us to defeat all the gracious counsels of God.

Well, but if we defeat Christ of his *loving any other Brethren*; yet still [neither men, nor Angels will have any other thoughts, but that he is still the first-begotten among many Brethren.] So may Mr. *Goodwin*, I wis, in all their judgement be still the *first* of all his Church, though all the Members of his Church fall from him one

after

after another to Mr. *Barber*, or some other shaver; for that Mr. *Goodwin* is nothing the lesse qualified, to be their signal Pastor, and Doctor.

But why comes in this of [Angels,] I cannot imagine, unlesse you would have us take the paines to ascend into heaven, and *aske their judgement* in the point, before we presume to *gainsay yours*, who belike have consulted them upon it, and have it under their hands.

But whatever either men or Angels may think of it, [Christ himself owned, and built upon this consideration, when he spake thus by the mouth of one of his greatest Prophets, *Though* Israel *be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength*, Esay 49. 5. In the former verse he said thus in the person of his Representator, *Then I said, I have laboured in vaine, I have spent my strength for nought, and in vaine; yet surely my judgement is with the Lord, and my work with my God.* And immediately before, *And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the wombe, to be his servant, to bring* Jacob *again to him; Though* Israel *be not gathered, yet, &c.* Clearly implying, that though Gods counsel was to forme Christ from the wombe for this end and purpose, to bring *Jacob* again to him; yet would it be no disparagement unto Christ, nor any miscarriage, or defeature of the counsel of God, though *Jacob* were not upon this account brought again to him. The reason is, because God formed not Christ with any purpose, that he should bring *Jacob* again to him by head and shoulders; but to *bring* Jacob *again to him, &c.* i. e. that he might be represented, and preached to *Jacob*, as such a person who had attoned their sins, made their peace, and had purchased grace and favour for them, and every good thing at the hand of God, in case they would repent, and turne again to him.]

And certainly, if this be [*all that* was intended, that *Christ should be preached to Jacob*, as such a person who had attoned their sins;] this seemes to be spoken of the *Representor*, the *Preacher of Christ*, rather then of Christ himself.

1. And is that all? we poor men have been taught, that Christ *purchased repentance for them*, and that, *that was given to them for his sake.* Master *Goodwin* makes *Jacob* and his posterity lesse indebted to God, then we humbly conceived them; and sure, unlesse he give them *repentance*, as much as they are beholding to him for never so many *other mercies* designed to them, they will never be so blessed, as to be *actual partakers* of *one* of them; only perhaps not being able to *pay him any service*, (they are so miserable bankrupts,) they are to be discharged from *prison* upon the new *Act in that behalf.* Mr. *Goodwin* deserves a very good Fee from his *bankrupt Clients*; and as little as they have to pay their *debts*; they are worthy to lie for ever in *irons*, if they finde not out somewhat wherewith to *gratifie him*, for his charitable and learned endeavours in the prosecution of their businesse.

2. What if all this be spoken but of the *person of Christs Representor*, as you stiled the Prophet,) not of Christ himself? and that it were never intended by God; that his Representor should bring *all Jacob*, but only the *Elect* of *Jacob*; and yet *all* were *bound to returne* upon his *preaching*, and he shall have nothing the lesse *reward* of his labour, though the greater part of *Jacob* have no considerable *benefit* by it?

3. Nay, what if *Christ himself* were set for the *fall*, as well *as rising again of many in Israel*; and though he were formed, especially to *bring Jacob again*; yet that be but the *especial part of Jacob*, those which were of the Election of grace? The current of Scripture runs strongly this way, and it is much more honourable to God, to say, *Christ brought again as many as God intended he should*, then that *he brought but a few again, when God* in his eternal counsell decreed he should bring *all again.* We say, God here *intended not* the bringing again of *more* then were *brought again*: the *sufficiency of Christs death* to reconcile *all*, in case they should *repent*, we acknowledge, but that would have been *insufficient* to bring *any again*; had it been sufficient only to bring them again, *in case they repented* in their *own strength*; for surely no man would or could have repented to *life* upon these termes. We had rather say, Christ

brings

brings men again [by head and ſhoulders,] then that *any men returne* meerly upon their own *heads*, without his *drawing* of them; yea, without his *carrying* them, as it were upon his *ſhoulders*.

Repentance, ſay *we*, is *Gods gift*, and we think the Apoſtle will own this ſpeech, *Then hath God alſo given to the Gentiles Repentance unto life*, *Act.* 11.18. If *God give* not *repentance*, no preaching will bring any of the children of *Jacob* to advance it upon their own *ſtock*; ſo then Mr. *Goodwin* hath at once ſo admirably provided for ſaving the honour of the indefeiſableneſſe of Gods intentions of ſaving men, though they do not repent, and ſo be not ſaved; that withal he upholds the *honour of men that are ſaved*, that they need not thank God for their *repentance*, whatever they ſhall pleaſe to do for their *ſalvation*.

2. But if this of the *Old Teſtament* will not do the feat, and *Jacob* ſhould wreſtle too well with it; yet hath Mr. *Goodwin* a Text out of the *New*, that carries it *contra gentes*; [The Apoſtle *Paul* likewiſe upon the ſame conſideration, ſaith of himſelf, and other the Apoſtles, and faithful Miniſters, that *they are unto God a ſweet ſavour in Chriſt, even in them that periſh*, 2 Cor. 2.15. Whereby it appeares, that howſoever Gods real intent and deſigne in ſending Chriſt into the world, was, according to the frequent teſtimony of Scriptures, the ſalvation, and not the periſhing, or condemnation of men; yet he was no more defeated, or diſappointed of his deſigne herein by the periſhing, then by the ſalvation of men.]

1. If you take *not comparatively*, it is true; if *negatively*, *not*; God intended the *fall of ſome*, and that of *Iſrael*; not the *ſalvation of all men* all *the world* over, in his ſending of Chriſt.

2. It is true therefore, that [God is not defeated in his intention in ſending of Chriſt by the periſhing of the greater part of men,] he never intended their ſalvation.

But, 3. If any *one* of *thoſe*, *Whoſe ſalvation God intended* in the ſending of Chriſt, that is, any *one* of his *Elect*, or any *one Believer*; if any who are not *Elect*, ſhould be ſo happy as to *believe*, without faith of *Gods giving*, or *Chriſts purchaſing*; I ſay, if any of thoſe whoſe ſalvation God intended, ſhould periſh, Gods intention ſhould be defeated.

4. But what Creature is this that I hear bellowing, [God was no more defeated of his deſigne by the periſhing, then by the ſalvation of men?] without all peradventure, if any were *ſaved* whom God intended to leave to *periſh*, and any *periſhed* whom God intended to *ſave*, God was equally defeated by the *ſalvation of thoſe*, and *the periſhing of theſe*; but if God *equally intended to ſave all*, and equally intended *to condemne none*, as you uſe to carry it, then the *condemnation* of any, lookes at leaſt like an *altering*, if not a *defeating* of his deſigne; and queſtionleſſe a great deal more then the *ſalvation of men*, as you ſpeak; which terme men, is, I think, indefinite; and therefore the matter in hand being but contingent, weighs no more then a *particular*; ſo then the *condemnation of men*, i. e. *ſome men*, as *viz. Reprobates*, doth, I grant, [no more defeat the intention of God, then the ſalvation of men,] *i. e. ſome men*, as *viz.* the *Elect*. But [the ſalvation of men,] viz. *any men* according to your dictates, cannot defeat the intention of God, as who *intended the ſalvation of all men*; but I hope the *condemnation of ſome men*, as *Believers*, muſt needs do it. Yea, the *condemnation of any men*, is according to your dear principles, a *defeating* of Gods counſel, rather then the *ſalvation of* all men would be; *All men* having a *power to work out their ſalvation, and God having no will* (unleſs ſuch as the new Canters call conſequent,) that *any man ſhould periſh*.

But when all is done, Gods counſel muſt needs be defeated, if either *Chriſt have no Brethren in glory*, ſeeing God ordained he ſhould be the *firſt-borne among many Brethren*; or if *all men ſhould be his Brethren*, ſeeing though God ordained him to be the firſt-borne among *many Brethren*; yet he ordained but *few* in compariſon of the whole maſſe of mankinde to be *his Brethren*.

And at parting, I pray let me leave this Remembrance with you; that if Brethren

here ſignifie as much as [the children of men,] as you gloſſified it but now, then indeed Chriſt ſhould be the firſt-begotten among *many Brethren*, whether *any man* were *ſaved* or no; for all *the damned men* will appear to be *his Brethren* upon this account; and then what pittie it is, you have taken all this worthy paines to ſo ſmall purpoſe, to prove [that Chriſt ſhould be the *firſt-borne among many Brethren*, though no *man at all were ſaved?*] Alas, it is not glory, nor grace, but *nature* that makes men *Chriſts Brethren* in your ſenſe, and ſo the *damned men* are as *much* his *Brethren* as the *ſaved*. Well, that you may not altogether loſe the reward of this labour, you ſhall have my vote to be the eldeſt brother at *Baſingſtone*, if his Lordſhip will be intreated to give way to it upon a humble motion at one of his next Courts.

[2. For the phraſe, or manner of expreſſion, *that he might be the firſt-borne among many Brethren*; you deſire to give notice once for all, that it is frequent in Scripture, to expreſſe a thing after the manner of an event, or conſequent that will, or ſhall come to paſſe, or follow upon ſuch an occaſion, or meanes, ſomewayes likely to produce it, which yet frequently comes not to paſſe; but only is intended, or deſired; nay, the contrary whereof many times comes to paſſe inſtead thereof; as *Deut.* 17. 12, 13. *The man that ſhall do preſumptuouſly, &c. ſhall be put to death, and all* Iſrael *ſhall hear, and fear.*]

I have met with this obſervation and inſtance once before; and replied, that this, *ſhall hear and fear*, ſignifies only a *precept* on *Gods* part, and nothing like an event; but only a *duty* on *his peoples*. So whereas [you tell us of *Deut.* 17. 19. *He*, viz. the King, *ſhall read therein*, viz. *the book of the Law, that he may learne*; *Shall read*, is a *precept*; that *he may learn*, is a *duty*; but ſignifies not an *intention*, either on the *Kings* part, or the *Lords*, that he *ſhould learne*; but *this, that he might be the firſt-borne*, clearly expreſſeth the *end*, whereunto God ordained all *his own actions* of *Calling, Juſtifying, &c.* There is a palpable difference between the *end* of *our actions*, and *our own, the agents*. The end of *our actions* is many times ſuch as juſtles out that of *the agents*; but *Gods end*, though it may be oft-times different from that of *his actions themſelves*; yet is it alwayes accompliſhed, even by *thoſe actions* which tend to *another*, and *contrary* end in *their own nature*; and more eſpecially *by thoſe* which have a *direct tendency unto it*, as hath his *Calling* and *Juſtifying* men, which directly lead to their *glory, that Chriſt may be the firſt-borne among many Brethren.*

§. 51. You have not done with this Text, till you have anſwered [one objection more againſt your Interpretation, and it runs thus: *If either they who are predeſtinated, may not be called; or they who are called, not be juſtified; or they who are juſtified, not be glorified: How can the Apoſtles proof ſtand,* that *All things work together for good to them that love God*; which is the *Doctrine, or Concluſion, the demonſtration whereof is acknowledged to be intended by the Apoſtle, in producing this golden chaine of Divine Acts? Can all things be ſaid to work together for good, to him who never comes to be glorified, but to be everlaſtingly condemned?*

To this you anſwer, [that this is to be underſtood, with ſuch a graine of ſpiritual ſalt, as thoſe other Scriptures: *Whoſoever believeth not, ſhall be damned; whoſoever believeth, ſhall be ſaved:* where he intends not to aſſert an inſeparableneſſe of *unbelief*, from the *perſon* in the *former*; nor of *faith*, from the *perſon* in the *latter* clauſe; but meerly an inſeparableneſſe of *Damnation*, from the *perſon continuing* in *unbelief* in the former; and of *ſalvation*, from the *perſon continuing* in *faith* in the latter. And ſo accordingly here he intends but to ſignifie the working of all things for good to the *perſons* that *love God*; not an inſeparableneſſe of either *Gods love from them*, or elſe conſequently the *working of all things together for good unto them.*]

I anſwer, were there no more in the Text then this, *All things work together for good to them that love God*, I would yield you all you ſay upon the place; But, I beſeech you, 1. What meanes this addition of, *to them that are the called*; (do any *love God before* they *are called?*) but to ſhew, that this truth, *All things work together for*

good

good to them that love God; is bottomed not upon *their love of God* ſo much, as *Gods love to them* in *calling* them in an *eſpecial manner the called*; they *who love God*, we will grant you, may as of *themſelves ceaſe* to *love him*, and ſo all things ceaſe to work together for their good, which is ſuſpended on *their love of him*; but *their love of God*, I hope, doth not *precede the calling of God*, and as they cannot *begin* to *love God before they be called*; ſo being *the called*, they ſhall *never ceaſe to love God. Gods love to them* will preſerve *their love to him*, *his gifts and calling being without repentance*. 2. What meanes this ſuperaddition, *according to the purpoſe of his will*; but to ſhew, that *this will of God*, and *his purpoſe* is *that* whereon their *calling depends*, as well as *their love of God* on *their calling by God?* Now if God may *alter* the *purpoſe of his will to make them love him*, and *all things work together for their good*, then it is true, you are like to do fearful execution upon this naked objection; but elſe it may with ſufficient confidence play on the very mouth of your Cannon. So little harme have you done againſt our argument from this Text; and only taken a great deal of *pains*, more then you are like to have *gain*.

Volvitur Ixion, & ſe ſequitúrque fugítque.

§. 52. You deal here againſt our Argument for the perſeverance of the Saints, wont to be drawn from *Jer.* 31. 39. & 32.40. *I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them.* And *I will make an everlaſting Covenant with them, that I will not turne away from them to do them good; but I will put my fear into their hearts, that they ſhall not depart from me.* [In theſe words, you ſay, your Antagoniſts in the preſent controverſie pretend to diſcover an abſolute promiſe of perſeverance, made by God unto his Church.] Take their meaning right, *to his Church*, that is, in reſpect of *ſuch* as are *true Believers, Saints really*, and not *in outward profeſſion only*; ſhortly, ſuch as are *Elect*.

Againſt this you oppoſe,

[From the whole tenor of this Chapter, 1. That the words containe a ſpecial promiſe made particularly to the Jewes. 2. That this promiſe was made to the whole body, or generality of them. 3. That it was made to the whole body of them, conſidered as being now in the iron furnace of the Babylonian captivity. 4. That the promiſe relates unto, and concernes their reduction from that captivity into their own land. And therefore cannot it be a promiſe of abſolute, and final perſeverance unto the Saints, to the end of their lives reſpectively.]

I anſwer, The Apoſtle had been a happy man, had he had your help to open this Scripture to him; the ſenſe whereof, it ſeemes, he did not ſo well underſtand; for we have the charity to think he did not wilfully miſapply it, in the 8. Chapter to the *Heb.* This promiſe, alas, [was of reſtoring of the Jewes from the Babylonian furnace into their own land; and when that was done, was the promiſe fully accompliſhed.] *Paul* forgot himſelf when he ſpake of it, as concerning thoſe of *his age*; and eſpecially as belonging, or appertaining any way to any of thoſe that ſhould *read his Epiſtle* in the *latter* ages; alas, [this was a promiſe, made upon a particular occaſion, of a particular bleſſing, to every particular man of the Jewes of that time, and under a generall condition, which needed not be particularly expreſſed; ſo that it was, it ſeemes, as weakly done of poor *Paul*, to lay ſo much ſtrength on this Text for his purpoſe, to ſhew the more eminent perfection of the Goſpel above the Law, as it is for thoſe ſilly, but ſawcy men, that dare preſume to be [your Antagoniſts in the preſent controverſie,] to alledge it for the *perſeverance of the Saints*. But let us examine it a little more narrowly, and ſee whether nothing be to be ſaid in *Pauls* behalf at leaſt, if not *ours*; or whether we muſt all cry *peccavi*, together with a *quæſo Præceptor*.

And 1. What if the [*Promiſe were made particularly to the Jewes,*] in reſpect of the preſent proclaiming of it? can it not poſſibly extend to any of the poor Gentiles, in regard of *any future benefit by it?* Then farewell all hopes any *Engliſhmen* have

to get any considerable good, by *most* if *any* of the promises in the Writings of the Prophets, who sure did all addresse themselves to the Jewes *particularly*; and for any thing appeares, did not as much as think of any poor *Britanes*.

2. What if [the promise were made to the whole body of the Nation of the Jewes,] must it needs make for the advantage of every *particular person of that Nation*, and not only of the *Saints*; and such only as *are of Israel*, as sure all *Israel* were not, if the Apostle be not at another losse? *Rom.* 9.

3. What if [it were made upon a particular occasion,] is it not therefore to be made use of, but upon that particular occasion? and doth the sense of it extend no further then the latitude of that occasion? then the Scriptures were not so written, *that* we *through patience and comfort of them, are like to have any* considerable *hope*; and this same *Paul* hath the luck to be out again.

4. What if it be yielded, [to relate unto their restoring out of the Babylonian furnace,] doth it relate no further? then it gives us still very *cold comfort*; but we had thought that, that of *Tertullian* had been very Orthodoxly spoken, that *Quadam particulariter dicta, generaliter sapiunt.* So then, it seems, your Arguments are not all *Achillea*; and now instead of *quaeso Praeceptor, à trepido vix abstinet ira Magistro.*

But yet we will hold our blow, and patiently attend what amends you will make, by the more learned Lecture, which you will read us in what followes. You begin:

[1. The promise was made unto the body, or generality of this people, even unto all those, that God had driven into all Countries, in his anger and fury; and not only unto the Saints, or true Believers amongst them; unlesse we shall say, that they [were only the holy persons amongst them] *that were thus driven by him.*

I answer, 1. If the promise were made, as you say here, [to all those that God had driven into all Countries in his anger,] then not only to those that [*were cast into the furnace of Babylon,*] as you said before.

2. That albeit this promise were made to all those that were driven thus into all Countries; yet was it only *proclaimed* to such as were *within hearing*, which those in *all Countreys* were not.

3. That therefore it concernes *those who could not hear* when it was *first proclaimed*; For [it concernes *all those who were driven into all Countreys,*] and yet was it not so *proclaimed* in *all countreys.*

4. That it concernes *all*, that is, *genera singulorum*, not *singula generum*: all the *Saints* in all Countreys, and that too in all ages; yea, it respects, I yield you, such as were then *unfaithful*; but only such of them, as should in Gods good time be *made true Believers*; and what though it were spoken, [as to all the Jewes,] what then? as the Apostle, *Israel*, that is, *all Israel hath not obtained, but the Election hath obtained it*, Rom. 11.7. *And what if some did not believe, shall their unbelief make the faith of God of none effect?* Many things spoken in Scripture *to the whole Nation of the Jewes*, are yet spoken *of such* as *were*, or *should be Jewes indeed, inwardly such*; and the seed of *Abraham*, not according to the *flesh*, but after the *Spirit.* And to all these is here made a promise of perseverance in grace.

[2 You say, The promise here made, was a promise appropriated, and fitted to the present state and condition of the Jewes. Now the promise of perseverance in grace, according to the Doctine of our adversaries, was a standing promise amongst them; and so had been from the first equally respecting them, or the Elect amongst them, in every state or condition.]

I answer, this promise, though *made* to these particulars, upon this particular occasion, may as well as many others, be *made use* of by *all particular true Believers*, on any other occasion, nor need this be any newes to any one who knowes to what *end* the Scriptures were written.

[3. Say you, The promise of perseverance in grace, according to the same principles, includes in it such an interposure of God by his Spirit and Grace, which shall

ſhall, and will, and muſt needs infallibly produce the effect of perſeverance, in all thoſe to whom it is made, *i. e.* true Believers. Whereas evident it is from the Prophet *Ezekiel*, that this promiſe notwithſtanding, the Jewes might rebell, and Apoſtatize from God.] But, ſay I, *none of thoſe*, who were intended in this *promiſe*; for though God promiſe to make *his Elect* walk in his wayes, and not depart from them, and they accordingly *do ſo*; yet nothing hinders, but he may leave *others* to *walk after the heart of their deteſtable things*, till he recompence their way upon their own head [This *threatening* concernes] indeed [the *ſame Nation*.] but not the *ſame perſons* of the Nation to whom this promiſe was made. And you may be ſure, though [*Calvin* underſtand it of the *Iſraelites*,] yet *he* would *diſtinguiſh* of *Iſraelites*, as *Paul* did, and tell you, that though the Prophet *ſpake to all*, he *ſpake not of all*; but only of *the Iſrael of God*.

[4. Say you, If abſolute perſeverance be here promiſed, there is no time, or ſeaſon can be imagined, wherein the promiſe ſhould have been fulfilled by God.] Why man? Yes, [if it be ſaid (ſay you) that it hath alwayes been fulfilled in the Elect, and faithful; you *have* no leſſe then two anſwers] at hand, ſuch as they are,

1. You tell us, that [it hath been already proved, that this promiſe was made to the maine body of the Jewiſh Nation, and not only to the Elect, and faithful amongſt them.] It is enough for me to reply, It hath been diſproved; and therefore though it be fulfilled only in *the Elect*, it hath been fulfilled as *farre* as was *intended*.

2. You ſay, [If this be all the fulfilling of it, it was as much fulfilled, during the time of their captivity; yea, and before it, as at any time afterwards; for in the ſenſe of thoſe againſt whom we now argue, the Elect, and faithful alwayes perſevered in grace unto the end.]

I anſwer, 1. That it is true, they did ſo; and this promiſe was all along *made to the Elect*, though in *this caſe* more *clearly* and *ſweetly proclaimed*. And is it ſo ſtrange, that *old promiſes* ſhould be *new made*? I had thought it had been the *ſame promiſe of Chriſt*, which God made to the Fathers *in all ages*; ſay it was *unneceſſary* to make ſo *frequent* a *rehearſal* of the ſame thing, and ſo often to inculcate it.

2. That though [this promiſe was all along fulfilled in the Elect,] yet not ſo *eminently* as in the *dayes of the Goſpel*, when *more Elect lived*, and *more of the Spirit*, of the *graces*, of the *comforts* of it, were plentifully poured out. Their *perſeverance* was now more *eminent*, as their *perſecutions* were more *cruel*. Herein was this promiſe fulfilled, that in the greateſt oppoſitions of Tyrants, ſeductions of Hereticks, ſuggeſtions of Satan, *they were kept* ſafe *by the power of God through faith to ſalvation*; and that they grew *ſtronger* in the midſt of all endeavours to *weaken* their faith; *flouriſhed* the more, for being *blaſted*; *ſpread* the *fairer*, for being *lopt*; *laught* at *ſorrowes*; *triumphed* in *tribulations*; *hugged death*; and were ſignally *victorious* in all varieties of *ſufferings*.

[If it be yet demanded (ſay you) *But do not thoſe words, I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever*; as alſo thoſe, *I will put my fear in their hearts, that they may not depart from me*, plainly imply their final perſeverance?] You anſwer, §. 53.

[1. That *they ſhall not depart from me*, ſavour too much of the Tranſlation; the Original would rather have them thus, *that they may not depart from me*, pro non recedere, ut non recedant à me, *Arias Montanus* in the Margin; and ſo, *that they may fear me for ever*.]

I reply, that even this *potential*, muſt be equivalent to a *future*; for elſe the *ſtrength* of their own *will*, may according to you, *enable* them *that they may not*; therefore this addition muſt be, *that they ſhall not depart*, in the *event*. And when you anſwer,

[2. That theſe words do not neceſſarily import the actual event, or taking place of the effect intended by God; but only his intention it ſelf, together with the ſufficiency of what he promiſeth, for the producing of ſuch an effect in them.]

I reply, that *Gods intention* ſeconded with ſufficient meanes to produce the effect, *cannot poſſibly miſcarry*; and therefore the *event* muſt infallibly be produced. Nor matters it that [our Saviour expreſſeth himſelf thus, *Theſe things I ſay, that ye might be ſaved, and that ye might have life.*] This he ſpake as *man*, it argues not in him an *intention* that they ſhould be ſaved, as he *was God*; which had he *intended* as *God*, could not but have been *effected*. Nor is there, by your leave, the ſame conſideration of what [God ſaid to *Adam*, *Haſt thou eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee that thou ſhouldſt not eat?* Theſe words, *that thou ſhould'ſt not eat*, ſhew what God intended ſhould be *Adams duty*, not what he intended ſhould be *Adams practiſe*. This is a *Command*, and ſignifies no more then what God ordained *Adam* ſhould be *bound not to do*, not what he intended *Adam* ſhould be *prevented*, ſo as *not to do*.]

[3. Say you, The certainty of the continuance of the external and civil proſperity of the Jewiſh Nation, might much more colourably be concluded, from ſundry paſſages in this promiſſory contexture of Scripture, then the certainty of their perſeverance in grace, from thoſe mentioned. For here God promiſeth, *that he will do* thus and thus by them, *for the good of them, and of their children after them*, verſ. 39. And again, *that he will make an everlaſting Covenant with them, that he will not turne away from them to do them good; that he will rejoyce over them to do them good, and will plant them in their own land*; aſſuredly *with his whole heart, and with his whole ſoule*, verſ. 40, 41. And yet we know that all theſe promiſes, and engagements notwithſtanding, ſince the making of them, God hath turned away from them, and that in greater diſpleaſure then ever before; yea, and that they are the moſt miſerable Nation under heaven.

This plainly ſheweth, that all theſe promiſes were conditional; If then the temporal promiſes were conditional, and have ſuffered a non-performance, through the non-performance of the condition intended, why may we not ſuppoſe the ſpiritual promiſes alſo to be ſubject to the ſame Law?] I anſwer,

1. That the *temporal* promiſes were indeed *conditional*, yet not the *ſpiritual*; the *temporal* promiſes being *conditional*, inferre not the *ſpiritual* to be ſo; ſome of the *ſpiritual* promiſes are of a *more high* nature, and of things which God *will do abſolutely*, without expecting *any thing to be done by his people* to lead him to it; but the temporal promiſes are of things which God will do when his *children ſhall do their duty*, ſo as they may receive the performance of theſe promiſes as *rewards*, and *encouragements*; the *temporal* promiſes are with a *ſubordination* to *ſpiritual* things, ſo as may make moſt for the advantage of the children of God in *ſpirituals*; the *ſpiritual* promiſes are not made in ſuch a *ſubordination* to *temporal*; yea, they are rather to *help* them in the *loſſe* of *temporal* things, then to make them *gainers* of temporal things; the *ſpiritual* promiſes are of *ſuch things* as we may confidently *preſſe God with them* to *performe* them, and not *yield* to be *denied*; the *temporal* are ſuch, as we are to *reſt* in the *pleaſure* of God, and may not preſume to deſire them with too much *importunity*; you ſeem to ſpeak ſomewhat lawleſly, when you make Gods *temporal* promiſes and *ſpiritual* to fall under [the *ſame Law*,] and eſpecially when you adde,

4. [That had the ſpiritual promiſes been meerly poſitive, and unconditioned, the temporal would have been ſo alſo, at leaſt they had not been obnoxious to a non-performance; for had God given them one heart, and one way, ſo that they had actually feared him for ever, queſtionleſſe all the temporall promiſes had brought forth.]

I anſwer, 1. This is a queſtion; for what, I pray, think you of *Job*, *a man fearing God, and eſchewing evil?* yet did he finde a conſiderable interruption in the performance of temporal promiſes; and God *with-holds* thoſe things ſometimes in more *love* and *bounty*, then he uſeth to *beſtow* them.

2. I may grant, [had theſe ſpiritual promiſes been performed to all, the temporall would have been performed alſo.] But I deny that theſe *ſpiritual promiſes* were *made to more* then Gods *Elect*, to *Iſrael*, *that was of Iſrael*; and when you annex

5. [That

[5. That expreſſion in the ſaid paſſages; *And I will make an everlaſting Covenant with them*, plainly ſuppoſeth, that the whole contexture of promiſes therein was but conditional; it being the nature of a Covenant, never to engage one party alone, but both: and all compriſed in it; and when one party refuſeth to make good the termes impoſed thereby upon him, to diſoblige and free the other.]

I anſwer, 1. That the *condition required* on the *peoples* part, is the *thing promiſed* on *Gods* part to *his Sonne*, upon a *condition*, which was *fully*, and *accurately* performed by *him*. God *promiſeth to put his fear in the hearts of his people, that they ſhall not depart from him*; *Their non-departing from him*, cannot be a *condition of Gods putting his fear into their hearts*; for it is clear, till *God put his fear into their hearts*, they do *all run, both from* him, and *againſt* him at once.

6. And laſtly, ſay you, [The true, and clear intent, and meaning of the ſpiritual promiſes, made unto the people of the Jewes, now in captivity, in the Scripture in hand is this, *I will give them one heart, &c.* i. e. I will deal ſo above meaſure graciouſly with them, as well in things relating to their ſpiritual, as in things relating to their temporal condition; that if they be not prodigiouſly refractory, ſtubborne, and unthankful, I will overcome their evil with good, and will cauſe them to own me for their God, and will reduce them to ſuch a temper, that they ſhall with a full and free purpoſe of heart fear, and ſerve me for ever.]

Well ſaid; but what *overcoming* is there on *Gods part*, if there be not a *refractorineſſe* on his *peoples?* or what *heart of his* peoples is there, which is not *refractory?* or what heart *ſo refractory*, that God *cannot overcome?* and doth not he oft-times *overcome* hearts *more refractory*, and let paſſe others *leſſe refractory?* You put all the *work of Gods Spirits efficacy* upon the *leſſe refractorineſſe* of *mens own hearts*; and when all is done, according to you, the *beſt heart*, though *not conſtantly refractory*, may on a *ſudden* defeat the moſt *eminent work* of *Gods Spirit*.

And how much this makes for the honour of his grace, *Piorum eſto judicium*. To ſecure this your interpretation, you ſay,

[1. This is to be remembred, that it is the frequent Dialect of Scripture, to aſcribe the doing of things, or the effects themſelves unto thoſe, whether God or men, who either miniſter occaſions, or afford proper or likely meanes, or endeavours for the doing of them, whether they be effected or no; and that you have ſhewed this in this preſent Chapter, Sect. 20.] I deſire the Reader to review my Anſwer, and he will finde your pleaſant inſtances ſound harſhly enough; whereas you ſay that [it will be impoſſible for any man to finde any other ſenſe, wherein theſe promiſes ſhould ever be fulfilled,] you talk at the rate of your wonted confidence, but which may pleaſe to alight upon the conſideration of the ſlender ſufficiency of your three following Arguments.

The firſt runs thus, [Theſe promiſes were made to a *great* number of men, the whole Nation of the Jewes, *Ergo* cannot be ſaid to be fulfilled in a *few*, the *Elect* only amongſt them.]

I anſwer, this hath been alledged, and anſwered before, that it was made only to the *Elect* among the *Iewes*, not to *every perſon of the* Nation; to *the children of the promiſe*, and none *elſe*; and in *all them* was it punctually fulfilled.

The ſecond thus, *ad hominem*, [According to your adverſaries the Elect might, yea, muſt needs have had every whit as much comfort, without theſe promiſes, as they could have with, or by them: For they knew before the making of any of theſe promiſes to them, that being *Elect*, and once in a ſtate of grace, they ſhould perſevere unto the end.]

I anſwer, 1. You impoſe upon us, in ſaying that according to our judgement, the Elect muſt needs have ſo much comfort; for that they knew before theſe promiſes, that being in a ſtate of grace, they ſhould perſevere unto the end, is more then any of your ſilly adverſaries ever adventured to affirme. We ſay, 1. The *Elect till they believe*, have *no comfort* by theſe *promiſes* at all. 2. The *Elect* do not *preſently finde* the comfort *after* they *believe*; many ſad thoughts ever and anon interpoſe,

terpoſe, to darken their ſpirits. 3. That *long after* they have *believed*, even *that they ſhall perſevere*, they are apt to be *encountred* with *new temptations* to their *old infidelity*; and the *renewing of promiſes* is of a *great* and *high neceſſity* for the ſupporting of their ſoules, ever and anon ready to ſwoon in ſuch fits. 4. That this promiſe was never ſo *clearly expreſſed before*, as at *this time*; and this was done *now*, to keep up the hearts of Gods children with *ſpiritual hopes* under *temporal* preſſures; and they are *ſuch promiſes*, as *decies repetita placebunt*. 5. That if the Elect did know as much as was here promiſed; yet was the *inculcation* of it of ſpecial comfort; as *you*, I ſuppoſe, *ſometimes* do; I am ſure *I often* have found much ſweet *comfort* in a ſeaſonable application of *plain truthes*, which I was not *ignorant* of *before*. It ſeemes ordinarily none is *comfortable* to your learned godlineſſe, but *new light*, ſuch as is *new*, as we ſay, *ſpack* and *ſpang*, and came but even out of the *Mint*.

Sir, do you conceive that all are *impertinences* that you deliver to your people, in caſe they *all knew them before*? then either you never bring any *old things out of your treaſury*, which yet the Apoſtle was not aſhamed to do, and thought he did it not without the profit of the people; or elſe your Auditors have miſerable *weak memories*, to whom thoſe *old things* do *all ſeem new*. But what if the *ſame things* be *old* in regard of their *ſubſtance*, yet *new* in regard of their *furniture*? So was *this promiſe* here put in a *new dreſſe*; the *new dreſſe* made it the *more pleaſant*, the *oldneſſe* made it the *more ſure*; each made it the *more comfortable*, none but Mr. *Goodwins* ſqueamiſh wit can make it an *impertinency*.

The third falls about us thus: [To ſay, theſe promiſes were fulfilled in the Elect, in the ſenſe gainſaid, is to begge the queſtion, inſtead of digging for it;] Sir, in this caſe I ſee you have no minde to *digge*, though you ſay, we are not aſhamed to *begge*; but inſtead of begging the *queſtion*, we queſtion why you charge us with begging? we have brought arguments wherewith to make it good, that this promiſe was not made to the *whole Nation of the Iewes*, but only to the *Elect*.

[2. The next thing you would have to be remembred for the ſecuring of your interpretation, is, that the Scriptures many times aſſert the futurity, or coming to paſſe of things not yet in being; not only when the coming to paſſe of them is certain, or certainly known to God, but upon a probability only, or likelyhood of their coming to paſſe, in reſpect of meanes uſed, or to be uſed for the bringing of them to paſſe.]

I pray Sir, what are theſe things which are *not certainly* known to God, either that they will, or that they will not come to paſſe certainly, but hang in the ſuſpenſe of a probability before his eyes? I had thought every thing *not certainly known to God that it will come to paſſe*, had been *certainly known to God that it will not come to paſſe*. Before you ſpake for the honour of his *intentions*, that they are capable of being *defeated*; now for the glory of his *omniſcience*, that it wanes now and then in the *fluctuation* of a *conjecture*, and ſees no further then *a probability* or *likelyhood*; but, I pray, what *probability* or *likelyhood* is there to him of the coming to paſſe of what he hath not determined to bring effectually to paſſe? and what he hath determined to bring to paſſe, hath, I trow, more then a likelyhood to come to paſſe; unleſſe it be likely that Gods *determinations* may chance to prove *abortive*. Well, but [upon this account God is repreſented by our Saviour in his Parable of the Vineyard, as ſpeaking thus in the Perſon of the Lord of the Vineyard, *They will reverence my Son.*] But, I take it, the Parable ſpeaks of the *Lord of the Vineyard* as of a *man*, ver. 1. and if the *Lord of the Vineyard ſpeak like a man*, it is no wonder he ſpeak of ſomewhat *as probable to man to come to paſſe*, that yet was *certain to God* would *not come to paſſe*. Will you apply every part of this Parable unto the Lord of the Vineyard as *God*? I pray, what think you of his *going into a farre countrey*? ver. 1. This fetch of yours is as farre as the remoteſt countrey from the *ſcope of our Saviour*, which is the only thing *argumentative* in the *Parable*. You may perhaps as well conclude it probable, God had once *more ſons*, becauſe it is ſaid, having *yet one Son*, as if he had had *once more*; but they all died away, and none remained but *one*, *in* that reſpect the *more beloved*.

Your

Your next inſtance is of the ſame value, [So when he ſaith upon occaſion of the puniſhment, which he commandeth to be inflicted upon the man that ſhould do preſumptuouſly; *that all the people ſhall hear, and fear, and do no more preſumptuouſly.* He doth not ſpeak it of any certainty of knowledge in him, that it would, or ſhould actually ſo come to paſſe; but becauſe the ſevere execution was a probable meanes to reſtraine all ſorts of perſons, from ſpeaking preſumptuouſly.] To whom I pray was this meanes of ſuch [*probability?*] to God it ſeemes; whereon to ground ſuch a conjectural prediction: Good Sir, this is a *precept*, not a *prediction*; it *injoynes* all *men* to fear, doth not *foretell* they will fear. God did certainly *foreknow* I hope, that *all won'd not fear*; do you conceive he *knew it but uncertainly?* he certainly knew, and ſo do we poor men too, that *all ſhould fear*, that is, they *ought to fear*; but that they *would not*, *he foreknew* as *certainly*. Whereas you referre your Reader to this Chapter, Sect. 50. I ſhall referre him alſo to Chap. 2. Sect. 13. where he may chance to finde this ſame Scripture urged by you, as worthily to the ſame purpoſe, and as fully anſwered by me. Which being done, the ſenſe which you put upon the Text under debate at preſent, upon the conformity it hath with this Text, is fairly blown off. But when as you tell us of [Gods purpoſe to afford ſuch excellent adminiſtrations of his grace and Spirit, which ſhould be very pregnant, proper, and efficacious to create ſuch a new heart in them;] Me thinkes you ſhould have added, unleſſe they had been more then ordinarily refractory, [that they ſhould never have declined from his Worſhip and Service,] I pray bethink your ſelf, how you can allow ſo much efficacy to the Spirit of God, and his grace, without injury to the native liberty of mans will, which according to the honour you are wont to put upon it, is alwayes in a capacity of declining; Now that God ſhould afford ſuch graces, (which ſure he doth not to all that we can yet find,) as ſhould ſo *wrong them*, as to put them into a *condition* that [they *ſhould never decline from his Worſhip and Service, while the Sun and Moon endure,*] is that which as long as the *Sun and Moon endure*, they will never give us *light enough* to ſee. This anſwer of yours you acknowledge, is [of much affinity with the former,] It is ſo; *ovo prognatus eodem*, and hath alike tender care of the *glory of Gods excellencies*. You adde,

3. And laſtly, [That no ſuch ſenſe was intended by God in the promiſe yet under conſideration, as a certainty of any final perſeverance in grace, in thoſe to whom it was ſpoken, appears from all thoſe prophetical predictions, of that ſad breach, which afterwards happened between God and his people, to a rejection of them from being any more a people unto him.] *Ergo*, ſay I, this promiſe was not made to the *Nation*, but to the *remnant* of his *people*, to *whom* it was exactly *performed*; how Gods *prediction of the breach between him and his people could* conſiſt with a *knowledge* of *probability* and *likelyhood*, that they would be brought to a due accord with him, (of which you ſo learnedly Philoſophized before,) is to me a riddle; and I ſhall be glad to find you ſuch an *Oedipus*, as to unfold it. In the mean time this Scripture never [complained] of any trouble that I have heard of, in being aſſeſſed to any contribution of aid, to the Doctrine of abſolute perſeverance; but you have *troubled* your *ſelf* to no purpoſe, in endeavouring to diſſwade it, from giving it that *relief*, which it glories to *afford*, and we rejoyce to *receive*.

Some other Scriptures you think [there poſſibly may be, beſides thoſe enquired into in this Chapter, in which ſome imagine, the treaſure of perſeverance to be hid.] Yea, Sir, we are bold to avouch, it lies not *hid in* the bowels, but *open* upon the *ſurface* of them; *great Rocks* of *precious ſtones*, which are ready to be wrought without hands, to be *pillars* for this Doctrine; and thoſe [*pillars*] which you boaſt, have been ſhewed to be [no ſupporters of it,] ſeem to ſtand *unſhaken*, in ſpight of all the ſtrength, your wit and learning hath ſet againſt them. And truly however you carry it, as if theſe which you have examined, were the *only* Texts; yet *we* ſay, you will meet with *many* and *many* more in the proceſſe of your tranſgreſſion, ere you come to the laſt Chapter; and finde them all as reſolute, as theſe in our behalf. What means your ingenuity to ſay, [Two Texts you call to minde, which are

ſometimes called in to help the Doctrine of Perſeverance, and not anſwered in this Chapter?] and have you anſwered *all* but *two*, and yet afterwards fall upon almoſt *twenty others* in every Chapter? This is apt to ſuggeſt to me, you intended an end of your ſaid tranſgreſſion, with *this* Chapter; and that the continuation of it in the *next*, was borne beyond your expectation, when you lay in with *this*; and that you thought this would have been your laſt *Travel*.

Poſtremum hunc Arethuſa mihi concede laborem;

Only afterwards you found your work to grow faſter and thicker under your hands, then you were aware. But for theſe two Texts you intimate you finde a ready way to throw them over the barre, and tell us, [the one, *Rom.* 11.29. hath been handled upon another account, Chap. 8. Sect. 56.] What is that I pray to the reckoning of *perſeverance?* yet *there* the Reader may ſee this Text hath gone through *our* hands alſo, and much leſſe damnified by them, then by *yours*. [The other which is, *Matth.* 7. 18. you will you conceive have occaſion to ſpeak of in the ſecond part of this diſcourſe,] at your better leaſure; in the *interim*, you fall [to examine ſome arguments and grounds otherwiſe] inſiſted on by us what are [theſe arguments and grounds otherwiſe?] diſtinguiſh them; are not all *arguments* and *grounds* materially the *ſame*, and are not *moſt*, if not all of thoſe you deal with, ſuch as are raiſed upon *Scriptures?* And how then comes it to paſſe we poor ſouls have no more but [*two other Texts conſiderable in the preſent buſineſſe?*] Thus your *Digreſſion* hitherto proves a *Prevarication*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III

In Answer to *Chap.* 11. of Mr. *Goodwins* Book, the Third of his Digression.

Wherein, as he pretends, the Arguments and Grounds, commonly alledged in defence of the received Doctrine of Perseverance, are detected of insufficiency, and proved and declared null.

SECT. 1.

YOU begin with that, which you are pleased to dignifie with the Title of [the first born of the strength of your Adversaries in this kind.

That which God hath promised in his Word, is certain, and shall take place against all opposition and contradiction whatsoever: But God hath promised in his Word, that all true Believers, shall both totally and finally persevere: Ergo, *All such shall so persevere.*[

You answer,

[1. By explaining the Major, What God hath promised in his Word, is certain and shall take place, in such a sense, and upon such termes, as God would be understood in his Promises.] Right; and what are the [*Terms*] upon which God hath promised Perseverance to Believers? If by *Perseverance* you mean *Perseverance to Salvation, Faith and Obedience*, are the *Terms*: Nor do we say, they shall be saved but upon continuing in *Faith and Obedience*. We say, that God will keep them *through Faith and Obedience to Glory*. If by Perseverance you mean Perseverance *in Faith*, upon what [termes] I pray, is that promised? Upon use of the meanes of Grace? We say, God will keep them in that too. Upon believing? that is to say, he hath promised *Perseverance in faith* to them, in case they *persevere in faith*; a goodly promise, and such as makes highly for the glory of God, and comfort of Believers, that they are promised they *shall not fall*, as *long as they stand*.

SECT. 2.

[The Minor also, relieved with a sober and Orthodox Explication, and likewise the Conclusion it self, and whole Argument, is blameless, and thinks no evil against your Doctrine. For it is most true that God hath promised that all true Believers shall persevere; *i. e.* that all true Believers formally considered, *i. e.* as such, and abiding such, shall persevere, *viz.* in his grace and favor.]

1. I must tell you, That you do not propose the Minor here as you did above: There you said this, God hath promised in his Word, that all true Believers shall both totally and finally persevere: here the Minor is as much too little, as there it was too great. We are not wont to say, That God hath promised that all true Believers shall [totally persevere:] We say, they shall not *totally fall away*; now it is one thing for them [totally to persevere;] another, not totally to fall away. None of them, by your leave, are said by us [totally to persevere.] That cannot consist, with our constant acknowledgment of the waving, and ebbings, and coolings of their Graces, whereof the Saints do ever and anon sadly

ſadly complain. But all of them are ſaid to be kept from *totally falling away*. They do not *totally perſevere*, if *any* part of their Graces do at *any* time ſuffer an *abatement*; they do not *totally fall away*, unleſs all their Graces be *loſt*: They may *all* ſuffer a *diminution* of Grace; yet none a *deſtruction* of it. Here's one Slip.

2. I muſt remember you, that when you limit the Minor to [Believers, as ſuch Believers perſevering in Gods grace and favor;] you miſtake the buſineſs; We ſpeak of that grace of God, whereof the Saints are the *Subjects*, not meerly of that whereof they are only the *Objects*: We ſpeak of Grace *wrought in them*, not only of Grace *ſhewed to them*; We ſpeak of their Holineſs, as well as their happineſs: this were a ſorry Promiſe, that as long as they continue loving to God, God will ſhew himſelf loving to them: This indeed is not the ſenſe of [the Argument Makers] as you call us in ſcoff. It ſeemes you make no Arguments, nor give us occaſion to revile you with the retortion of ſuch a nick-name. Our meaning is, That all true Believers (as you rightly report us) ſhall continue ſuch; that is Perſevere thus in believing; or in the truth of their Faith and Grace, [againſt all interveniencies whatſoever.] But you abuſe us too ſhamefully, when you father upon us, [That we add, That none of them ſhall ever make ſhipwrack of their faith, upon what quick-ſands of Luſt and Senſuality ſoever they ſhall ſtrike; againſt what Rocks of Obduration and Impenitencie ſoever they ſhall daſh.] We ſay, They ſhall be preſerved *from daſhing* ſo [againſt the Rocks of Obduration and Impenitency,] as to make ſhipwrack of their faith. This ſenſe you confeſs [to be ſore againſt you;] but you deſpiſe the proofs, as [weak] and [ſo contemptible] you render them, as to think it enough to tell us Magiſterially, [That none of the Scriptures, from which they preſume to claime countenance, will own them;] belike, not as much as look on them: and you add, you have [upon examination found the heart of them as much eſtranged from them,] as their faces may be thought to be towards them. Moſt of them you pretend are made to the [Jewiſh Nation in the Old Teſtament, and are to be meaſured with the ſame line of Interpretation.] I have taken the meaſure of that line, and ſhewed it to bee too ſhort, for the Scripture wherennto you applied it. And as for thoſe three Texts, which you here whiffle off, as if they were alſo [made to the whole body or generality of the Jewiſh Nation,] it is probable the firſt of them is made to the Church of the Gentiles, as are all the Promiſes in that Chapter, *Iſai.* 54. *Sing, O barren, thou that didſt not bear*, &c. And the ſecond ſeems to be ſo too, *Iſai.*59.21. *Zion* and *Jacob* being to be underſtood, not litterally, but myſtically: and ſure the laſt, *Hoſ.*2.20.21. is not to the [whole body of the Nation of the Jewes,] but to the Church of that Nation. But let us examine what you have to ſay to the particulars.

Jer.32.39.

SECT. 3. Iſai.54.10.

In the firſt, *For the Mountains ſhall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindneſs ſhall not depart from thee, neither ſhall the Covenant of my peace be removed, ſaith the Lord, that hath mercy upon thee*, Iſai.54.10. [Evident it is (ſay you) that there is nothing aſſerted or promiſed by God therein, but only his faithfulneſs in his Promiſes, and the ſure and certain performance of his Covenant. But that the tenor of this Covenant ſhould be, that they who once truly believe, ſhould be by him infallibly, and by a ſtrong hand, againſt all interpoſals of ſin, wickedneſs, backſliding, rebellion, whatſoever, preſerved in ſuch a faith, is not ſo much, as by any word, ſyllable, iota, or tittle here intimated.]

I anſwer 1. That if the Believers be not thus preſerved, Gods *kindneſs muſt firſt depart from them*, for ſure he wants not power to preſerve them ſo; and if his *power* be managed by his kindneſs, it muſt needs preſerve them ſo; and if his kindneſs depart not, it will not fail to manage his *power* to preſerve them ſo. Say, Shall Gods *kindneſs never depart from them*, and yet they depart *totally* and *finally* from their obedience? Then it ſeems *Gods kindneſs* ſhall continue with them, though they utterly revolt from God; and ſo God ſhall love them as dearly in their Apoſtacy, as in their Perſeverance; in their Rebellion, as their Obedience; and ſo

you

you muſt be glad to owne that miſhapen Monſter, which you have been wont to lay, at your pleaſure, at our doors. No Sir, we ſay, Gods kindneſs continuing to his people, keeps his people from living and dying in ſuch iniquities, as wherein it cannot ſtand with his *Honor* and *Truth* to ſhew *kindneſs* to them. And therefore ſeeing God promiſeth a *continuance of his kindneſs*, and an *irremoveableneſs of the Covenant of his peace*, it followes of courſe, that he will keep them from living and dying in wickedneſs; he having ſaid, *There is no peace to the wicked*, and threatned, that *though he made them, he will not have Mercy upon them; and though he formed them, ſhew them no favour.* And whereas you repeat, [How lately you have ſhewed, That it is contrary to the nature of a Covenant to impoſe Articles, and Conditions, only on one party, and to leave the other free.] I have as lately anſwered it, and now add, That however God ſpake as a *Covenanter*, expecting conditions from the other party; yet as God, who can expect no *good conditions* from any, but what are of his *own giving*; and it is his goodneſs that he binds *himſelf* to *give*, what he requires his *people* to *do*. The ſtrength is all from *him*, and the *work* too, more then from *themſelves*: He it is that *works all our works in us*. I pray, what other *Terms* doth God require of thoſe with whom he here Covenants, but what are of his *own giving*? *Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear, and your ſoul ſhall live.* And *I will make an everlaſting Covenant with you, even the ſure Mercies of David.* Sure, *David* would have acknowledged *this* was one of Gods *ſure Mercies*, that God *inclined his ear* when it was *averſe*, and *bored* it when it was barred; and cauſed him to have a *heart to hear* Gods Word, and *drew him to come to God*, who elſe would for ever have *gone aſtray like a loſt ſheep*; and that all his *inclining his ear*, *hearing*, *coming*, were *Effects* of Spiritual life, not *preparations* unto it. It is true, that [upon condition of their obedience, and faithfulneſs unto him, God here engageth himſelf to be a God, and glorious Benefactor unto them for ever; and that the breach thereof ſhould never be of his ſide.] But was not he [a God and glorious Benefactor unto them] before [they yeilded obedience, and ſhewed faithfulneſs to him?] Whence, I pray, had they their [obedience and faithfulneſs,] but from his Beneficence? It ſeems, you think, you are not beholding to God for your [obedience and faithfulneſs,] nor ſtand bound to him upon ſuch an account. Nay, were they not diſobedient and rebellious before God became ſuch a [Benefactor?] and will they not continue faithful in their obedience, as long as God works them to faithfulneſs and obedience? You muſt ſay, that here God *ſhuts up this his loving kindneſs in diſpleaſure*, if he withdraw the gracious influence of his Spirit: and what ſhould make him *withdraw* it from them, having made them *faithful*, that was comparable to what might have *with-held* him from ſhewing them mercy, *that they might be found faithful.*

SECT. 4. Iſai. 59. 21.

Concerning the ſecond place, *Iſai.* 59. 21. *As for me, this is my Covenant with them, ſaith the Lord, my Spirit ſhall not depart*, &c. You tell us, [1. It may as well be conceived, to be a charge or injunction of obedience unto the people, as a promiſe from God, of any thing; and that *Calvin* acknowledgeth ſome tranſlate the words in the Imperative Mood; and that the Future Tenſe will bear an Imperative conſtruction.] Right.

[According to this ſenſe (ſay you) the meaning is this: That Covenant of perpetual Grace and Mercy which I make with them, requireth this of them, in order to the performance of it on my part, that they quench not my Spirit which I ſhall put into them, nor forſake my word which I ſhall teach them.] Leave out the words, [in order to the performance of it on my part] and take all the reſt. We grant, God enjoyns them [not to quench his Spirit, nor forſake his Word] in order to the performance of *much* of his promiſe on his part; that is, everlaſting happineſs; but in order to their not *quenching his Spirit*, and *not forſaking his Word*, he promiſeth the continual influence and aſſiſtance of his Grace. Nor is it any new thing for God to promiſe to do in his people, what he requireth his people

to do. *Make you a new heart*, ſaith God, there is a *Precept*: *I will give you a new heart*, there is a *Promiſe*. *Caſt away all your iniquities*, there is a *Precept*; *I will purge away your iniquities*, there is a *Promiſe*. Shortly, there is nothing in the Scripture that God *injoyneth* his people to do, but he *engageth* himſelf to do it for them.

2. Say you, [If we look upon the paſſage, as promiſſory, there is little reaſon to judge it, as promiſing the gift of Perſeverance to true Believers, whatever their deportment be.]

Who ſaith, I pray, that it is? We ſay, it is a promiſe that their deportment ſhall be ſuch, *as to perſevere*. It were ſtrange, indeed, if God ſhould be conceived by us to promiſe Believers, *Perſeverance in Holineſs, while they ſhould revolt and rebel againſt him in all manner of wickedneſs*. This ſenſe you put on us as injuriouſly, as we ſhould put it on the *Promiſe abſurdly*. [Conditional promiſes unto Believers, of Perſeverance in Faith unto the end, as *viz.* upon their Chriſtian and good behaviour, diligence, &c. you queſtion not but that the Scripture abounds with them.] It is more then we can underſtand, why God ſhould promiſe [perſeverance in faith upon ſuch a behaviour,] as a *condition*; when as ſuch a behaviour *ſuppoſeth* perſeverance in Faith as a *Cauſe* of it: Nor can any poſſibly perſevere in a [Chriſtian behaviour] longer then they [perſevere in faith.] So that when you ſay, [It cannot be reaſonably gainſaid, that this promiſe is conditional;] you ſeem at laſt to be weary of your old [*digging*,] and to fall to a far eaſier trade of [*begging*,] which lately with ſufficient auſterity, you were pleaſed to object to your idle Adverſaries. But you add

3. [Thoſe words in the beginning, *de me*, ſeeme to import the promiſe enſuing, to be conditional; and that God is ready, willing, and reſolved, to deal worthily and bountifully with them, even according to all that which followeth: alwayes provided, that they, the other party, keep Covenant with him, and do what he requires them.] True, in order to *their glory*, not to *his keeping them in grace*: and theſe words, *de me*, on which you think fit to lay ſo much weight, ſeem to me to imply, That *this is Gods part to enable them to continue in his fear*. But

SECT. 5. 4. Granting (out of your ſpecial indulgence) the words to be promiſſory without condition, you pretend [Nothing can be more clear, then that they were directed to the whole Nation of the *Jewes*, not to Saints or true Believers only;] and gravely whiſper in our ears, [That the Apoſtle queſtionleſs underſtood them thus, and applies them to the whole Nation, *Rom.* 11.26. *And ſo all Iſrael ſhall be ſaved, as it is written, There ſhall come out of Zion a Deliverer, and turn away ungodlineſs from Jacob*, meaning all;] Forgetting belike what he ſaid before, that *all Iſrael, are not of Iſrael*. When, I pray, will that happy day come that we ſhall ſee [*all* and every one of the *Jewes* ſaved, and *ungodlineſs turned away* ſo univerſally from them?] *Craſtino Reſurrectionis* belike: Conſtrue the Text how you will for the *other* words; queſtionleſs this *all*, muſt be content with a fair reſtriction. There will never be ſo happy a *purge* given to the Nation, as to leave no *ill humor* in any member of it. What Deliverance is this, that ſhall free [all *Iſrael* from all their ſins?] And if God ſhall one day preſerve or turn [*all* the *Jewes* away from their backſliding] whereunto they and their Fathers have been ſo extremely ſubject, from the beginning; why may we not be allowed to think he doth work ſo effectually on *ſundry Chriſtians*, without intrenching upon the native priviledg of the freedom of their wills? But though we entertain ſuch thoughts of his operating ſo ſtrongly on the hearts of *ſome Chriſtians*, we cannot nouriſh the leaſt hope that he will ever work to ſuch a degree, or at ſuch a rate, upon *all the Jewes*: What, never a *rotten*, never an *unclean* member in the whole body of a Nation?

Rom. 11, 26.

Fœlices proavorum atavos, fœlicia dicat
Secula, quæ quondam ſub Regibus, atque Tribunis,
Viderunt uno, Conſenſum, Carere, Romam.

Tuſh

Tuſh, what is that? *Jeruſalem* ſhall be ſuch a holy City, as not to have one Malefactor within its walls; *Procul hinc, procul eſte profani.* No Spider, or other venemous worm, is able to live in this *purer* climate. We had thought this had been enough for *Jeruſalem which is above*, to be ſo free: But ſaith Mr. *Goodwin*, [All the Nation of the *Jewes*] here below, ſhall have their Reformation *bold*, it ſeems, to ſuch a *conſiſtency*, that not an *ungodly man ſhall be left*, none that ſhall do evil, *no not one*; and though our Engliſh Reformation might glory to tolerate *all* manner of errors in *Judgment*, the Jewiſh ſhall leave *none* in *practiſe*. [Theſe words preceding, *viz. All Iſrael ſhall be ſaved, as it is written, The Deliverer ſhall come out of Zion, and turn away ungodlineſs from Jacob*, being promiſſory, and that to the whole Nation, it is no wayes like (ſay you) but the words following being promiſſory alſo, and every way as appropriable to the whole Nation, as they, ſhould be every whit as extenſive and comprehenſive, in reſpect of the Object.] They are *tam, quam*. But how appears it, that the *all* in the former verſe reacheth *every particular member* of the *whole Nation?* The Prophets words are, *The Redeemer ſhall come to Zion, and to them that turn from tranſgreſſion in Jacob*; reſtrayning this Redemption only to the *Saints*, or *holy part* of the *Nation*; and they are thoſe to whom the Promiſe or Covenant is made in the next verſe, *This is my Covenant*, &c.

5. Well, but you go on, and add, [Whether the ſaid Promiſe be conceived to reſpect either the whole Nation, or only Believers; here's nothing that ſo much as ſembles a Promiſe of final Perſeverance unto either: This here promiſed being ſomewhat new: *that* Grace of final Perſeverance (according to the opinion of our Adverſaries) is common to all true Believers, and ſuch as God hath conferred upon one, and other (yea, add all) of this generation of men, from the beginning of the world.] He hath [conferred] it ſo; it followes not, he *promiſed* it ſo all along. God [conferred] many things more then he promiſed: or if he *promiſed* it, it followes not he promiſed it ſo clearly; and ſo this *new delivery* of an *old promiſe*, may make it *new*, as well as that of an *old Commandment* made it *new*, viz. *to love one another*. I beſeech you, what think you of the *new Covenant?* Was it not of a conſiderable antiquity? and yet will it ever be in an incapacity of being ſtiled *New?* And what of ſome new Songs of *David*, *Sing unto the Lord a new Song?* Is it now old, and muſt give place to your new Hymn, as being of a later and better ſetting, where Poetry it ſelf ſtands amaz'd, *Nec quo progrediatur habet?* Well, but SECT. 6.

6. And Laſtly, It is, ſay you, [very improper, and doth not look like one of the wiſe Diſpenſations of God, to make a ſerious and ſolemn promiſe unto men, of that which they might, and ought to expect of courſe; yea, and which they might with as much comfort and ſecurity have promiſed unto themſelves, as he.] Marry, this is ſomewhat yet, that [Men may promiſe themſelvs Perſeverance as well as God] that is, I hope, only upon your grounds, who talk ſo liberally of the Saints [Antipathy againſt ſin, and ſecurity from it, like that from deſtroying themſelves:] But we conceive, thus to *promiſe themſelves Perſeverance*, is to apoſtatize in a fearful degree: No (ſaith Mr. *G.*) [they promiſe it themſelves as well as he.] Truly, you might have done well to have added *better by far*, for *they* may do much in this kind, without any other aſſiſtance from him, then that univerſal Grace, which he is bound to give all men; but *he* cannot by any *ſpecial Grace* enable them to perſevere, unleſs they themſelves ſhall be content to make due uſe of it; and all the effieacy of Gods work lies purely at the pleaſure of their owne wills. I grant, true Believers might [expect perſeverance of courſe;] but I had thought this had been becauſe of *Gods gracious Promiſes*, not that they could have [promiſed it to themſelves, and that as well as he.] And what if they might [expect it of courſe,] doth it therefore [not look like one of the wiſe Diſpenſations of God, to make a ſerious and ſolemn promiſe of it?] The Righteous might of [courſe] have expected Gods Mercy: what an unwiſe part was it of the Prophet

Prophets to promiſe it to them, ſo often, ſo ſeriouſly, and ſolemnly, in the name of God? Tuſh, this [looks not like one of Gods wiſe Diſpenſations] to put ſo many unneceſſary Tautologies in his Prophets mouthes, and his peoples ears; they [might have promiſed this to themſelves as well as he] or his Prophets, and that too [with as much comfort and ſecurity.] It was enough, *God ſpake once*; what ſhould we be troubled to hear the ſame thing the ſecond time? *Verbum ſapienti*; and one doth as well as a thouſand, [for his comfort and ſecurity.]

Well, what is your Reverences Reaſon for this, [That the Godly might, with as much comfort and ſecurity have promiſed themſelves Perſeverance, as he?] Why, it is *ad hominem*, though not *ad rem*. [According to theſe principles (ſay you) which we now oppoſe, every true Believer may, and ought to expect the Grace of final Perſeverance from God, as matter of courſe, and of common and unalterable Diſpenſation, yea, and ſhall ſin if he doth it not.]

Be it ſo: Why, doth this follow, [He may expect it from God, as matter of courſe;] *ergo*, [He promiſeth it to himſelf as well as he, and that with as much comfort and ſecurity?] I had thought the Believer had *expected* this upon *Gods Promiſe*, had not *promiſed it himſelf* upon his *expectation*; and [that as well as God.] I may expect many things from you, if you promiſe them; ſhall I ſay, *I may promiſe them my ſelf as well as you*? you are here too Tropical, in taking *promiſing* for *expecting*. But let that paſs: Yet can they [*expect* it from themſelves as well as him?] Yes, according to your principles, a great deal better: conſidering how *great power* they have in *themſelves* to do *Good*, how *little God* hath *over them* to keep them from *evil*; which he can do no longer, then they ſhall vouchſafe to ſay, *Placet*.

SECT. 7. You come at length to give us the very marrow, no doubt, of this Promiſe; and tell us, [1. From the Learned *Muſculus*, that it is this, *That the Nation of the Jewes ſhall never from the dayes of Chriſt in the fleſh, be wholly, altogether, and in all the Members of it, deſtitute of the Spirit and Word of Chriſt.*]

Be it ſo; But I infer even hence, our Doctrine of Perſeverance: thus; If God have promiſed, That all the members of the Jewiſh Nation, ſhall never be deſtitute of the Spirit of Chriſt; then he hath promiſed, That the Spirit of Chriſt ſhall alwaies reſide in ſome of them; if it ſhall alwayes reſide in ſome of them, then God is able and willing to *put* it in ſome of them; if he be alwaies able and willing to *put* it in ſome of them, then he is alwayes able and willing to *keep* it in ſome of them: 1. *Able*, For there is a *leſs* power required to *keep* it in *thoſe* whom he *puts* it, being made of courſe *better* by it; then there is to *put* it into them, when they were *worſe*, or into *others*, who without the Spirit muſt be ſuppoſed *worſe*. 2 *Willing* to *keep* it in them, being now made *better*, as well as to *put* it in them when they were *worſe*; and ſo if [he will always put his Spirit into ſome of the *Jews*] we may conclude he will always keep it in ſome of them whom he hath put it; and if in *ſome*, then in *all*, for there is in this caſe the ſame reaſon of *all*. If you tell me, he will alwayes *put the Spirit into ſome* of them, but *not keep it in them*; and that he intends only to let the Spirit reſide ſo long in them as they are *willing to entertain him*: Say I, The Spirit, who (according to you) is [put into them,] I hope, when they are *leſs willing* to receive him, and graciouſly winds their hearts, ſo as to make them *willing to admit* him, is *able*, and accordingly as *willing* to ſtay there for ever; and how they ſhould be *able* to *eject* him, who were not *able* to *oppoſe* his *entrance*, is beyond all poſſibility of imagination. If they were able to *oppoſe his entrance*, then *one*, as well as *another*; and then God was too forward to promiſe [that he would never leave ſome of them without the Spirit of Chriſt] when as there was *none* of them but might have rejected him, and ſo made this Promiſe to fall as null. Thus we have gotten ſomewhat for the advantage of our poor Doctrine of Perſeverance, even by this ſenſe of the place, which you give to elude it; which notwithſtanding your boaſt, ſuppoſeth ſomething for the buſineſs of final Perſeverance. Well but

2. You

2. You tell us your own conceit concerning the ſenſe of the place, [That God rather promiſeth this. That he will advance the Diſpenſations of his Grace and Goodneſs, towards and amongſt this people, to ſuch an excellency, and height, that if they prove not extremely unworthy, and neglective above meaſure of their own happineſs, they ſhall have the Spirit and Word of God abundantly amongſt them, and conſequently, abundance of peace and happineſs for ever. The Promiſe thus underſtood began to operate and work, and was performed in part, upon that deliverance from their ſeventy years Captivity; wrought yet more effectually at the coming of the Meſſiah unto them in the fleſh: but the full and ſignal accompliſhment of it remaineth yet behind, and ſhall take place *when the Redeemer ſhall come out of Zion unto them,* and their Meſſiah viſit them the ſecond time.]

To this I anſwer, 1. That the [abundantly having of the Spirit among them] doth not depend, as for the *firſt infuſion* of it, upon their [not proving extremely unworthy.] For ſure, all Jewes, as well as Gentiles, are ſuch before the *firſt infuſion of the Spirit*; nay, the Spirit is oft-time moſt *abundantly infuſed* into thoſe who are moſt [extremely unworthy and neglective of their own happineſs,] above the proportion of the neglect of ſome others.

2. That the [abundant having of the Spirit,] is that which takes off this [neglect] in thoſe in whom it is.

3. That [at the ſecond coming of their Meſſiah unto them,] there will be no [neglect] in ſuch as ſhall be found to have the [Spirit ſo abundantly,] but he that is *Righteous, ſhall be righteous ſtill*; and no *infuſing* of it in the leaſt meaſure, into ſuch as have it not before; but *he that is filthy ſhall be filthy ſtill.* We conceive, [the ſecond coming of the Meſſiah] will be to *judge*, and *mete* out to every man according to his *works*, not to *convert any man.*

4. If [then they ſhall have the Spirit amongſt them, but in abundance,] then it ſeems *all* ſhall not have it; and if they ſhall have it, ſo as they may [prove extreme unworthy and neglective of their peace and happineſs,] then ſhall not [*all ungodlineſs be turned away from Jacob,*] according to the learned Expoſition which you lately gave of that place; and ſo it remains after all the terrible quoil which you have made about this Text, that we had better keep our ſelves to our own ſenſe, and underſtand it of the *Iſrael of God*; to whom we are willing to grant you, [That this Promiſe was made good by ſuch degrees] as you mention, not that the *Iſrael of God* had not alwaies the *Spirit preſerving them in faith to Salvation*, but that there were more of the *Iſrael of God*, in one age then another; and that though the *Iſrael of God* were alwaies *preſerved in faith to ſalvation*, yet not alwaies ſo *eminently preſerved from falling into ſin*, though ſtill from falling unto *Damnation.*

SECT. 8. Hoſ. 2. 20, 21.

For the third and laſt of the three places mentioned, *And I will betroth thee unto me for ever*, Hoſ. 2. 20, 21. It is, ſay you, [much of the ſame conſideration, nor hath any whit more in it to ſupport the common Doctrine of Perſeverance. For 1. The promiſe of *Betrothing* is here made to the intire Body of the Jewes, unbelievers as well as Believers, as appears by the carriage of the Chapter throughout.] And was it ſo? Who can ever believe, that God did [betroth unbelievers] unto him for ever? I confeſs, many of thoſe whom God intends, when he ſaith, *I will betroth thee unto me for ever*, were at *preſent unbelievers*; but that they ſhould not be made *Believers* in the very nick of the act of *Betrothing*. I deny. Hath God (think you) ſuch love to men in the ſtate of unbelief, as to *betroth them unto him for ever, continuing unbelievers*? It remains therefore, that either all the people of the Jewiſh Nation were made Believers, or they were never *betrothed* to God; and if they were never betrothed to God, what becomes of his Promiſe, as you pretend [to *betroth them unto him for ever?*] Now if they were *unbelievers* when God *promiſed* to *betroth* them unto him, I hope he made them *Believers* when he did *betroth* them; and if he did *betroth* them, as he promiſed

miſed to do, in *Righteouſneſs, Judgment, loving kindneſs, Mercy and Faithfulneſs*; ſure he would keep them *Believers*, having once *made* them ſo. Say, he wanted *power* to *keep* them ſo; and I deny he had *power* to *make* them ſo: The ſame power is required to make, that is required to *keep* them ſo; yea, it is ſomewhat *leſs* to *keep Believers* from becoming *unbelievers*, then it is to *make unbelievers* to become *Believers*. Say, he wanted *will*: what is become of his *loving kindneſs, Mercy and Faithfulneſs*?

2. Say you, [This Promiſe is conditional, and the betrothing is ſuſpended upon the repentance of this people, eſpecially of their Idolatry, and return to the true and pure Worſhip of God; which plainly ſheweth, that it was made as wel, nay rather, to thoſe that were wicked and Idolatrous among this people, then to any others, as being chiefly to wooe them from their Idolatry.]

I anſwer 1. That the *Promiſe was made*, as formerly, to *Idolaters*, but to be *performed* to *Believers* to be made ſuch by Gods own Grace. And for this [wooing] you ſpeak of, I hope that was *before betrothing*; now though he [wooed] them, while *Idolaters*, he did not *betroth* them till he had made them *Believers*: nor was any [wooing] able to do this; a *working* upon their hearts was neceſſarily required, and that was done in the *act of betrothing*. I pray, whence had they their [repentance] you ſpeak of? Was it not from God? And did God give them ſaving Repentance till he had given them Faith? *this* is that alone which *purifies the heart*; without this, all other Repentance is *to be repented of*; for God
Ver. 17. here promiſeth to *take away their Idols*, it is his work; and to *take away Baalim*, by making them *call him Iſhi*; that is ſure an *act of Faith*: all the *conditions* which you pretend God *requireth* of them, he promiſeth to *work in them*: to *take away the name of Baalim out of their mouth*; yea, and ſaith he, *They ſhall no more be remembred by their name*. But as if this were no part of Gods promiſe,

3. You add, [That it cannot be proved, that this Promiſe ſo properly or directly intends the collation of Spiritual, as Temporal Bleſſings.] Theſe [Temporal Bleſſings] are doubtleſs, a worthy *Joynture* for God to ſettle on his *Spouſe*. Yes, you may know, that theſe [Temporal Bleſſings] repreſent Spiritual; and farther, that *Spiritual* are *expreſſed* alſo: what think you of *Righteouſneſs, Judgment, loving kindneſs, Mercy, Faithfulneſs*? If you take theſe as to be underſtood on the *Spouſes* part, it is clear; if as to be underſtood on *Gods part*, yet ſure his *loving kindneſs, Mercy, Faithfulneſs*, wherein he promiſeth to *betroth them*, would of courſe draw *Spiritual Bleſſings* a great deal more then [Temporal:] what ſhould they be the better for [Temporal] without Spiritual? Spiritual were able to make them happy, not only without any Temporal Bleſſings, but under all Temporal plagues.

4 And laſtly, you come to give us your ſenſe of the Promiſe, and it is [As if he ſhould have ſaid thus, *When I ſhall by my Word and Spirit, and other gracious adminiſtrations ſo far prevail with them, and overcome them, as to cauſe them to caſt away their Idols, and turn to me with their whole heart, I will expreſs my ſelf with ſo much love to them, that they ſhall not lightly, neither they, nor their children after them, go a whoring from me any more, but remain united unto me in a chaſte and conjugal affection for ever. I will betroth them unto me in Righteouſneſs, and Judgment, and in loving kindneſs, and in Mercy*; q. d. *I will engage, and attempt to inſure them and their affections to me, by all variety of wayes and means, that are proper and likely to bring ſuch a thing to paſs.*]

Well ſaid; but if God wil [attempt to enſure them and their affections by all variety of Ways and Means that are likely and proper to bring ſuch a thing to paſs, as their conſtant adhering to him in a chaſte and conjugal affection,] then I hope he wil not fail to continue the *conſtant ſupport of his Spirit of Grace*, which alone is able to do it. And this is all that your ſorry Adverſaries contend for; if God do leſs then *this*, all your other [variety of wayes and means] will prove miſerably weak, and fall infinitely ſhort of effecting, what God, as you confeſs, [promiſeth to attempt.] Well fare you for this [attempting!] I never heard from any other

man

man, I am ſure, never from God in all his Book, that he [attempted] any thing that he did not *accompliſh*; *Is any thing too hard for the Lord?* if he [attempt to enſure his people and their affections to him,] what is there that can interpoſe, ſo as to defeat him? Yes, Mr. *Goodwin* knowes a ſecret obſtruction in the will of man, which can at any time hinder all the workings of God, even when he engageth and [attempteth to bring a thing to paſs, and that by all variety of wayes and means that are proper and likely to do it.] He hath examined the ſtate of the buſineſs ſo far, as he hath in the profound depth of his incomparable wiſdom, fully diſcovered many a rub, that lies in the way of God, and which inevitably hinders him in going on with what he [engaged and attempted with all variety of wayes and means that are proper, and in his apprehenſion, likely (forſooth) to bring a thing to paſs.] But let us ſee whether any, or all [theſe meanes which God will uſe to bring this thing to paſs; *viz.* the enſuring of his peoples hearts unto him, in a chaſte and conjugal affection,] be over [likely] to do it; and whether God did not forget a better means which was at hand, if theſe which you mention be all the means which he intends. As

1. Say you, [By ſhewing himſelf juſt and righteous unto them, in keeping his Promiſe concerning their deliverance out of Captivity, at the end of ſeventy years, not failing therein, no not to a day or hour.] But this means, conſidering how it miſcarried heretofore, when God ſhewed himſelf all as juſt and righteous in keeping his Promiſe to their Fathers in their deliverance out of *Egypt* at the end of Four hundred and thirty years, not failing therein, no not to a day: *In the ſelf ſame day it came to paſs*, Exod. 12 41. was not ſufficient to prevail with them. Belike thoſe *Jewes* were more conſidering then their *forefathers*, or elſe had better affections, and more compliant, that Gods keeping promiſe to them, for a deliverance at a day, after *ſeventy years* Captivity, would prevail more with them, then his keeping promiſe to their fathers, for a deliverance after Three hundred and forty years, to a *day*: or is it, that God promiſed now to an [*hour*?] That is more then the Prophets were acquainted with before, or the ſacred Scribes have acquainted us with ſince this Deliverance: Mr. *Goodwin* it ſeems hath had more punctual intelligence, belike from ſome of his conſciencious Confederates, in leaving the Rode. Let us examine the

2. Second Means that God looked upon, as ſo likely to bring this thing to paſs, [by puniſhing and judging their enemies, and deſtroying thoſe that led them Captive, and held them in Bondage and ſubjection.]

Alas, he did no ſuch thing upon the *Egyptians*, not upon *Pharaoh*, or any of his ſervants; he did no *wonders*, to ſpeak of, in *Egypt*, nor *Miracles in the fields of Zoan*; he never cauſed the *waters there to be turned into bloud*, nor *drowned horſes and Chariots in the red ſea*; no nor did any thing ſo momentous againſt *Egypt* as he did againſt *Babylon*; elſe, without all doubt, the *hearts* of his people (had he *turned his hand againſt their enemies* to any purpoſe) would never have *turned back from him*, but would ſtill have [faithfully adhered to him in a chaſte and conjugal affection.] Why, but

3. [He meant to heap the fruits of his love and kindneſs upon them otherwiſe, in giving them Peace, Plenty, Health, Honour, &c. in abundance;] and theſe without all peradventure, were ſuch Means as he ſaw [moſt likely to inſure their hearts to him in a chaſte and conjugal affection to him for ever.]

I pray, Did not God heap all theſe upon his people before, when he *brought them into a Land flowing with milk and honey*? And were not theſe rather occaſions of their *falling off from him*? Did not their Proſperity betray them to Deſtruction? Did not the abundance of ſuch Bleſſings, prove the decay of their Love and Zeal? And did not *Jeſurun kick* when he *waxed fat*? Were not their hearts beguiled by theſe Bleſſings, into a forgetfulneſs of the Donor? What rare influence, outward peace, and Plenty, Health and Honour, have to make men ſignally conſcientious? Never did *man being in honour, ſo want underſtanding, as to become like the beaſts that periſh.* Would God but ſupply his people with *Corn*,

and Wine, and Oyle, it matters not much for the lifting up of any *light of his countenance upon them*. Besides, he takes not so right a course in *bringing them through tribulation to the Kingdom of Heaven*: Did he break down all crosses, that so much block up their way, and then strew their pathes with Violets and Roses, in stead of the thornes; it were likely, none would be so unmindful of their own happiness, so unthankful for his bounty, as not to have their hearts knit to him for ever, in the indissoluble bonds of a [chaste and conjugal affection.]

4. And lastly, Say you, [God saith here, That by dealing mercifully with them, in pardoning their sins and infirmities, which they will commit daily against me:] (Sure, God never would have said, they [*committed infirmities*,] albeit, through infirmities they *committed sins.*) [I will not be extreme, to mark what they shall do amiss, whiles their hearts shall remain perfect with me.]

I confess, this of *pardoning their sins* is a singular means to knit their hearts unto God. But 1. Not so according to *your grounds*, who make such assurances of pardon of the sins which the Saints shall commit, a means to strengthen their hands to the committing of sin. 2. Not so neither in it *self*, but that God is pleased, where he *pardons*, to *purge*, and not only to *justifie*, but also to *sanctifie* his people. Now I beseech you consider, which of these means is [likely to effect such a chaste and conjugal affection to God,] one, or other, or all. No, it seems by what you add, [By these and all other ways and means, likely to endear my self to them, and to assure them and their affections to me for ever, I will really and effectually essay and try to do it.] Say you so? Then loe a better meanes then all these, which yet you thought not worth taking notice of it, which is to endear their hearts to him (which he hath in his hand) by *working upon them by his power, to their conversion and confirmation.* What wot you? is God able to do this, or no? If not, he is not *Omnipotent*; if he be, he doth not so [really and effectually essay and try to do it as he may;] nay, he doth not [by all the other means essay and try to do it effectually;] *this* is enough, *none* beside *this* to do it: and this is that we affirm God doth here promise. Nor doth there any [aire in the Annotations of our English Divines] breath ought to the contrary. What if [they Paraphrase it, *I will betroth*, and that is, I will establish my Covenant of Grace with thee, not only to *observe* that faith which is required in all Covenants; but also to forgive thee thy sins, and not to take notice of thy unworthiness?] What is here against Gods converting and confirming them by his power? nay, is not here an air of this, that he will convert them, notwithstanding their sins and unworthiness, without expecting that they should first dispose and prepare themselves, as the genius of your Doctrine would have it; and that he will confirm them too, all such obstacles notwithstanding?

But say you still [According to the sense of the place given, which cannot reasonably be gainsaid; the promise is not absolute, as to the *effect* of such a dispensation of the people, which should stand for ever; but only as to the *means*, yet these very efficacious and proper to be used by God, for the producing such an *effect*.]

Good Sir, God promiseth a *Betrothing*, not a *Wooing*; and if you mark it, the *wooing* is before the *allureing* her, and *bringing her into the wilderness*, as if it were to *talk* with her, where none should over-hear what passed between them, while he *spake comfortably unto her*. [*Taruvins* his word, *as much as in me lieth*, this betrothing shall stand firm for ever] surely is not *terminus diminuens*, though I confess you make more of it then the Latine will bear; which is not *quantum*, but *quod ad me*; but it signifieth rather an engaging of Gods *power*, and other *excellencies* for the continuance of this conjugal relation, notwithstanding all the weakness and remainders of wickedness in his Spouse, too apt on all smal occasions to break it off. Whatever you have said of the [using of meanes, being expressed in Scripture by the effects themselves,] hath been as often answered as alledged; and so without any disparagement to the reputation of their Learning and

Sobriety

Sobriety, thoſe Reverend Divines whom you ſay have been [ſomewhat ſtrangely tempted to build the Doctrine of Perſeverance on this Text,] may ſtill build as high as ever upon this *Rock*, that is abundantly ſufficient to bear all the weight they ſhall pleaſe to lay upon it.

SECT. 9. Pſalm 125.1.

You come now to try [the ſpirit of ſome other Texts] wherein your Adverſaries ſeem to diſcry a promiſe of final Perſeverance unto all *true Believers*; and the firſt you endeavor to elude, is, [*Pſalm* 125.1. *They which truſt in the Lord, ſhall be as Mount Sion, which cannot be removed, but abideth for ever.*] Well, let us ſee how you will beat us off from this *Mountain*, which you overlook, as if it were no more then a *molehill*, having a quick anſwer at hand; *viz.* [That here is no promiſe that they that truſt in the Lord, ſhall abide truſting in him for ever; but only that abiding ſo truſting, they ſhall never be removed from an eſtate or condition of peace and happineſs, into an eſtate of trouble or miſery; for the ſtability here promiſed, is of *happineſs* or *ſafety*, not of *faith*.]

But be pleaſed to conſider it a little better, 1, Whether God ever promiſed his people; that they ſhould have a [ſtability of *Peace and Happineſs*,] and be ſecured from all [trouble and miſery while they truſt in the Lord.] What think you of Goodman *Job*? *Though the Lord kill me* (ſaith he) *yet will I truſt in him.* Was his an [eſtate of Peace and Happineſs, free from all trouble and miſery?] Yes, *Job* never knew what it was to ſee *either*, in all his time; but as ſad newes, as the *Meſſengers* thought they had *brought* him; as great grief as his *friends* conceived they had *ſeen* in him: he was not within the line of Communication of [trouble and miſery,] nor had he any occaſion to exerciſe his patience, which is only of uſe in [trouble and miſery;] and as much as we are *wont* to admire his incomparable portion of this rare Grace, I wis, we have no cauſe at all to make ſo much of the matter; what ever he himſelf let fall of *miſerable Comforters*, Mr. *Goodwin* will ſhew us he had none but *comfortable miſeries*, and ſuch as only our poor ſpirits would call [trouble;] His truſt in the Lord kept all [trouble] at a ſufficient diſtance from him, and durſt not come near him while he was upon his own *dunghill*, though it be a [trouble] to others but to reflect on that *jolly poſture of his*. And what meant *David* to ſpeak of ſo much [trouble] of his own, in which he had *periſhed*, had not he been beholding to the *Law of God* for ſupport? and of *all other righteous men*, that they have *many troubles* while they *truſt in the Lord*? and ſo long they do, we trow, as they are *Righteous*. No [trouble] can lay hold on them, and little cauſe have their ſouls to pray God to deliver them, or any of *his Iſrael out of trouble*. The Righteous are never [troubled] with *enemies* abroad, with *afflictions* at home; their *bodies* are never [troubled] with what we call *Diſeaſes*, nor are their *ſouls* [troubled] with any ſuch things as *Diſtempers*. This is that [God hath promiſed them that they ſhall be out of all] gunſhot [of trouble] onely he hath left them without any ſuch ſecurity for their *faith*. But is there any thing can [trouble] a good man like to this, that his *faith*, (which it is true, ſweetly allayes the harſhneſs of all *troubles*, and makes him to *poſſeſs his ſoul* in the loſs of all things elſe, and in the midſt of all *tribulation* in the world, to triumph in expectation of the *glory that ſhall be revealed*; of the *Roſes* that grow upon theſe *Thornes*, and the *Grapes* and *Figs* which he ſhall one day gather from theſe *Thiſtles*,) that (I ſay) this *faith* of his is in continual danger of being forfeited? as needs it muſt, unleſs God have pleaſed to engage himſelf to preſerve it. Talk what you will of their [ſafety and happineſs,] if their *faith* be no *ſafer* then you make it, they can never be without continual revolutions of *trouble*; be their peace with other men what it will, how little will they have with *themſelves*? eſpecially conſidering what *Luſts* are ever and anon ready to be up in armes in their *boſomes*, what *aſſaults Satan* as conſtantly makes on their *ſouls*; ſurely all *trouble in the world*, is nothing to this *world of trouble*, that will ariſe from their *fears* and *jealouſies* of *themſelves*. If you peruſe the Pſalm, you ſhall find, *this is that* which God endeavors to ſecure them in, that *the rod of the wicked ſhall not reſt on the*

lot of the Righteous, left they put forth their hand unto wickedneſs: It is not to ſecure them from *ſuffering*, otherwiſe then in order to keep them from *ſinning*; not from *trouble*, but as to keep them from *tranſgreſſions*. This is that which they chiefly *fear*, and this accordingly is the *fear* from which God promiſeth to *deliver them*, ver. 3. to *do good* unto them, ſo as to keep them *good*; to *keep evil* from them, that they may be *kept from evil*. They chuſe *any affliction* rather then *ſin*, and fear *ſin* more then all *affliction*. So that hitherto our Argument out of this Text, ſtands like *Mount Sion, not to be removed* by all the *Earth-quakes* you have as yet endeavoured to raiſe. Yea, but you tell us

[God ſpeaks in this Text to his people, but as his ſervant *Paul* did once to his Corinthians, when he ſaid, That *they were in his heart to dye and live together with them:* His meaning was not, that they were ſo *in his heart to dye, &c.* that what ever manner of perſons they ſhould prove afterwards, though they ſhould Apoſtatize to Idolatry, Blaſphemy, Heatheniſm, or the like, he could be notwithſtanding, well content to *live and die with them.* But thus they were in his *heart*, *i. e.* they were for the preſent ſuch perſons as he ſingularly loved and affected, and with whom he could well be content to hold communion both in death and life.]

Very true: but had the Apoſtle the Corinthians *in his heart*, as God hath his *peoples heart in his hands*? had the Apoſtle been *able*, queſtionleſs his love would have imployed his *power* to preſerve them from [Apoſtatizing to Idolatry, Blaſphemy, Heatheniſm, and the like.] Say now, Is God *able* to do thus, or no? If *not*, no more needs be ſaid; if he be, yeild him but as tenderly *affected* as Saint *Paul*, and there is no fear of the Apoſtatizing of any of his Saints, whom he ſo tenderly *loves*, and ſets his *heart* upon. True it is, *Paul* not being *able* to keep the Corinthians from turning to ſuch wicked courſes, muſt of courſe turn much of his affections from them, in caſe they ſhould ſo debauch themſelves: but God who hath ſet his affections on his people, having a ſufficiency of *power* to preſerve them from ſuch miſcarriages, muſt be ſuppoſed to *with-hold* his people from ſuch miſcarriages as would provoke him to *with-draw* his affection from his people.

You are pleaſed to remember us next of a worthy [note which you have formerly, more then once (out of your goodneſs) communicated to us, that Gods *Promiſes* made to men, with reſpect to ſuch and ſuch ſpecial qualifications, are to be underſtood with ſuch an Explication or Caution, wherewith his *threatnings* againſt ſuch and ſuch particular ſins are to be interpreted.] But you may vouchſafe to take notice, that this hath been already examined in the places where you formerly produced it: nor ſhall I need add more then this; That albeit Gods *Promiſes of Glory in heaven*, yea, and *comfort on earth*, be ſuſpended on ſuch *conditions* of *not revolting*, as his *threatnings* are on *conditions* of *non repenting*; yet his *Promiſes of Grace*, whereby to keep them from falling, at leaſt to *bring them to repentance*, are not. And ſuch is the *Promiſe* of the Text, as doth appear upon a due examination of the whole Pſalm; the main thing intended being to ſecure them againſt the fear of *ſinning*, through the temptation of *ſuffering*, that *they ſhall not put forth their hand unto wickedneſs.*

SECT. 10. John 4.14.

You eſſay to wreſt from us [another Text of Scripture, *John* 4.14. *But whoſoever drinketh of the water that I ſhall give him, ſhall never thirſt; but the water that I ſhall give him, ſhall be in him a well of water, ſpringing up to eternal life.*] This you would fain perſwade us [doth no more (if ſo much) then face the buſineſs in hand; for here is no Promiſe made, that whoſoever *once believe*, how unworthily ſoever they ſhall carry themſelves, ſhall ſtill be preſerved by the Spirit of God in believing.] Who (man) ever ſaid thus? all that we teach, is, That *who once believe, ſhall be preſerved from behaving themſelves ſo unworthily as to loſe their faith.* This is an old piece of Grollery, whereby you have endeavoured to abuſe your credulous Reader all along this your Digreſſion. Well, but [This

Text

Text (say you) containes only a declaration of the excellency and desirableness of that life which he comes to give unto the world, above the life of Nature.] No such matter, good Doctor: Here is not a word of the [desirableness or excellency of the life which Christ comes to give,] but of the excellency, and in this respect, desirableness of those *precious waters of life*; that is, not of *life eternal*, or *glory in Heaven*, but meerly of the *Word of Life* in the *Graces of his Spirit*, conveyed by that *word* to his people here on *earth*. Well, but

[This (say you) is evident by comparing the words transcribed, with those in the former Verse, *Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinks of this water* (*i. e.* of material water, such as this well affordeth) *shall thirst again*: *But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him*, &c. *q. d.* the *best means* that can be had or enjoyed, to render this present life free from inconvenience, will not effect it; the condition of this life being subject to dissolution, will not admit of any such freedom or perfection.]

This is all without Book. Here is in the Text not one syllable that looks toward any such thing, as the [dissolution of life,] but meerly at the *insufficiency* of the *water* to prevent all future *thirst*. And why you should conclude from the *insufficiency of this water of Jacobs well* to prevent all *future thirst*, that the [best means that can be had or enjoyed to render this present life free from inconveniences, are insufficient,] is more then I, or any vulgar Logician, is able to discern. You must have a rare dexterity, to shew that the *water* of *Jacobs well* was [the best Means that could be had or enjoyed to render this present life free from inconveniences:] If so, sure *Jacob* was to blame to be so *prodigal* of it, as to let his *Cattle drink of it*, as well as *himself and his sons*. He should have kept *this water* as carefully, I say not, as any good House-keepers do their *March-beer*, or their *sweet drink*, (of which they do not use to let their servants, no not children, nor ordinary neighbours to taste too familiarly,) but as they do their *Sack*, or *Rosa Solis*, which they afford not to *themselves*, but on more especial occasions, when they are overcome by the strong importunity of their weaker stomacks. If *Jacobs well* were such as you think fit to represent it, yeilding water which was [the best means that could be had or enjoyed to render this present life free from inconveniences:] Surely it was beyond those at *Tunbridge*, or any other Wells that we have heard of in *Europe*. But as much as it yeilded [the best means to render life free from inconveniences] I would not wish you so much harm, as that you should for the Delinquences in this your Book, be put to such a Pennance, as our Statute at *Excester Colledge* imposed on the negligence of Mr. *Subdeane*, to have a cup of *this water* of *Jacobs well* to help to digest a good *buttered brick-bat* for your *break-fast*. It would not be a Grace out of *Pindarus*, Ἄεισον μὴ δῶρα, that would be enough to *sanctifie this water*, so as to make it other then the mother of many sore Rheumes, and Catarrhes, as much as hitherto you have pleased to render it as the [best means that can be had or enjoyed to preserve this present life from inconveniences.] Sir, Christ in this place looked no farther then this one ordinary quality in the water, to *quench thirst*, and it could not so do it, but that the Drinker would *thirst again*; he takes occasion hence to mind the good woman of the more excellent nature of his *Spiritual water*, the *Grace* which he is pleased to afford by his Spirit, co-operating with the word, to put the hearts of his Saints into such a blessed temper, as they shall *thirst* no more, but shall have as it were, a *Well springing up in them to eternal life*. He speaks meerly of the excellency of *Spiritual waters*, above those *material waters* of *Jacobs* well, not of the [excellency of the life eternal above natural.] I yeild [life eternal] is mentioned in the latter clause; but 1. Not otherwise then to shew the excellency of his *Spiritual waters*, and so *secondarily*, and upon the by. 2. This *eternal life* here mentioned, seems to be not so much the *effect* of these *Spiritual waters* as to the *Drinker*, as an *adjunct* rather of these Spiritual waters in themselves, but which of course produceth such an *effect*, that they are *perpetual*; not like those of a *cistern*, which are apt quickly to *lose* their freshness, and grow *flat* and *dead*; but like those of a

quick-

quick-ſpring or *fountain*, which ſtill retain their *life* and *briſkneſs*: compare John 7.38. So that here he ſpeaks of the *permanency of his Grace* in its own *nature*, not of the *perpetuity of happineſs* accruing thereby, to ſuch as are *partakers* of it; but the *permanency of Grace*, of courſe infers a *perpetuity of happineſs*; that is, the *permanency of Grace*, is of courſe attended with an *eternity of glory*. So that what you add, of [Chriſts not oppoſing that life which accrues unto men by drinking the waters which he gives them, unto that natural life, which they live by other means, in reſpect of the preſent condition or conſtitution of it, or as it is enjoyed by men in this preſent world,] is not pertinent: He oppoſeth only the water of his *Doctrine* and *Grace*, whereby he gives men *eternal life*, to that *water* the good woman was drawing, which could not ſo ſatisfie her *thirſt*, but that ſhe ſhould *thirſt again*: the vertue of that water would *ſhortly* be loſt, and the benefit of it at *laſt* moſt certainly; but this is ſuch as *alwaies retaines* its vertue, and the *operation* it hath on ſuch as drink it, remains to *eternity*. He doth not ſpeak of *eternal life* as *free from thirſt*, and this *life*, as not *freeable from it in it ſelf*; but of *theſe waters*, the *material inſufficient* to ſlake thirſt for *ever*, the *Spiritual ſufficient* to do it: from the one well the woman could but fetch *water in a Pitcher*; a *few drops* of the other would beget a *well* in whoever drinks them, ſpringing up continually; yea this well would ſend forth *Rivers of living water*, John 7.38. But let us examine what you alledge, whether you prove this more ſolidly then you propoſe it pertinently.

Now [we know (ſay you) that the Saints themſelves, notwithſtanding the life of Grace, which is in them by drinking the water which Chriſt hath given them, are yet ſubject to both kinds of thirſt, as well that which is corporal] what of that? [as that which is Spiritual.]

No ſuch matter; that they are ſubject to *Spiritual thirſt* in our Saviours *ſenſe*, who aimes not at a *deſire of more water*, as intending to *deny that*; but a *deficiency of moiſture*, or *lack of the grace of his Spirit*, and denyes this: this *deſire* of *more* argues the *excellency of this water*; never able to *ſatisfie*, much leſs to *oppreſs* a man, and make him vomit it up again (as the water of *Jacobs* well would have done him, that ſhould have perſwaded himſelf to drink too much of it,) but ſetting an edge upon his appetite, with *quo plus ſunt potæ, plus ſitiuntur aquæ*; not a *deficiency* of moiſture, but a *raviſhment* of that moiſture, as the cauſe of this *pleaſing* and *happy thirſt*, which hath nothing in it of that *pain* and *torture* wherewith the *other thirſt* is often accompanied.

Nay, but you have one trick more by the way [This Spiritual thirſt (ſay you) which is incident unto that life which is derived by Chriſt, and the waters given by him unto men, as it is enjoyed or poſſeſſed by them in this preſent world, is according to the purport of our Saviours own arguing in the Scripture, under preſent debate, an Argument, that for the preſent, and whiles it is obnoxious to ſuch a thirſt, it is diſſolveable and may fail.] How appears that? why [for in the latter part of that paſſage, he plainly implies, that the eternalneſs of that life, which ſprings from the drinking of his waters is the reaſon or cauſe why it is exempted from thirſt.]

Good Sir, The Eternalneſs of it, is an *effect* rather of its being exempted from thirſt, as the diſſolution of natural life is an *effect* of *thirſt*; our Saviour gives not the *eternalneſs of that life* for a *cauſe* of that lives being exempted from thirſt; but at moſt having ſpoken how that water of his *exempts from thirſt*, he adds, *it is a well ſpringing up to eternal life*; this is a cauſe of his *aſſertion* of his waters exempting from thirſt, not of *his waters exempting from thirſt*, which he *aſſerts*; the Particle *for*, is purely *rational*, not *cauſal*. Now then, what becomes of your Inference which followes, [If then the Eternality of a life be the cauſe or reaſon why it is free from the inconvenience of thirſt: evident it is, that ſuch a life which is not free from thirſt, is not during this weakneſs of it, priviledged againſt all diſſolution.] Your Aſſumption muſt be, *But the eternality of a life is the cauſe or reaſon why it is free from the inconvenience of thirſt*. *Negatur*; it is a *Reaſon*, not

not a *Cauſe* of it, but a *Conſequent or effect*; our bodies in Heaven ſhall not therefore not need meat and drink to repair them, *becauſe* they ſhall be *eternal*; but becauſe they need neither meat nor drink to repair them, *therefore* they are *eternal*. I confeſs, their *Incorruptibility* is a *cauſe* of their not needing meat or drink; and their *Incorruptibility* is *fundamentaly*, the ſame with their *eternality*, but not *formally*; their *Incorruptibility* in the preciſe notion of it, ſignifies an *immunity* from all ſecret tendency to diſſolution from *within*, and from all open violence from *without*; but doth not ſignifie directly a *perpetuity of their duration*: Their *eternality* ſignifies *neither* of theſe *directly*, though it *connotate both*; but onely a *perpetuity* of their duration; yea, that which hath both a ſecret tendency to diſſolution from *within*, and a liableneſs to open violence from *without*, as to its *own nature*, may yet be preſerved (notwithſtanding either or both) by a *Superiour Power, to Eternity*. And thus hitherto you have no reaſon to brag of having wonne the Game, as ſubtilly as you may think you have plaid it. SECT. II.

You proceed, and ſay, [You eaſily grant, that ſuch a life as we now ſpeak of, may, notwithſtanding the diſſolveableneſs of it, be in a ſenſe called eternal, as it is frequently called in Scriptures; *viz. in ſemine*, or *in fieri*, as they ſay; as the conception of a man in the womb, may be called a man; or becauſe, in reſpect of the native and imbred tendency of it, and being duely nouriſhed and preſerved, it is apt in time to become eternal, formally, and properly ſo called. Even as the conception of a man in the womb, by reaſon of the natural frame and tendency of it, will in time, if it meet with no natural accident by the way, come to be a man in his full ſtature and ſtrength. But as this frame or tendency of the Conception we ſpeak of, doth no wayes prove, that therefore it muſt of neceſſity become a perfect man, ſo neither is it neceſſary, that the life in the Saints, which is ſeminally, inchoately, and conception-wiſe, eternal, ſhould againſt all poſſible occurrences of things averſe to it, come to be actually, properly, and completely eternal.]

I would fain know, 1. Whether the *eternal life* of the Saints, under the notion of *eternal*, be ever other then [*in fieri*?] if it be once in *facto eſſe*, I know not what to make of it. *Eternity* ſignifies a *perpetuity* of duration; and how that ſhould be in *facto eſſe*, is unintelligible to any but ſuch as travelled as far as your ſelf in the *terra incognita* of ſoch remote ſpeculations.

2. I am more to ſeek, how [this life is apt in time to become eternal;] that is another ſtrain, which I ſhall never reach, though I ſtretch my wits to it all my time, and as you uſe to langnage it, to the dayes of eternity. For, do you refer [in time,] to [be apt,] or elſe, to [become eternal?] 1. If to thoſe words [be apt,] then it is as apt [*in ſemine*, and *in fieri*,] as you call it, at the firſt conception (as I may ſay) as at any time after. The *aptitude* is, I confeſs, to have a little more *patience*, and expect a longer time till it be *actuated* and *compleated*; but there is a *complete aptneſs*, and foraſmuch as is in the nature of the thing, not *remota*, but *proxima*; a child in the firſt inſtant of his birth, is thus as [apt to become a man of full ſtature,] as he is at ten yeers old: as *apt to become* a man of full ſtature, though not *apt to become ſuch as ſoon*. The child at his firſt birth, is obnoxious to more *accidental occurrences*, which may hinder his coming to be a man of full ſtature; but he hath the ſame *eſſential aptitude* to become ſuch the *firſt* day, as the *tenth* year of his life. And this is the caſe with that *life of the Saints*, conſidered by you [conception-wiſe,] in order to its becoming eternal. 2. If you refer thoſe words, *in time*, to [become eternal] thus, [*This life is apt in time to become eternal*,] then you may very well deſire time for a clearer explication of this choice notion, *How a thing may in time become eternal*. i. e. *become eternal in time*. 3. If you refer them to [become,] thus, This life is apt in time to *become* eternal: What is that *becoming*, *in fieri*, or *in facto eſſe*? If *in fieri*, it was thus, The firſt time apt to *become eternal*, as coming unto it: If *in facto eſſe*, ſhew what Eternity that is, and *ipſo facto*, we will endeavour

deavour that your reverend name may be continued to this kind of Eternity.

3. What though [a conception, may be called a man, becauſe apt to become a man?] Who ever called it a [man of full ſtature?] And ſo, if this life be only apt to become *life* which may be *eternal*, who would call it *life eternal* upon that account? When [we call a conception a man,] I hope we do not by *man* mean [a man of full ſtature,] no nor a *man child*: *Man* in the latter ſenſe, a *man-child*, is the name of a *Sex*, which is accidental, as well as that of a [*man* of perfect ſtature;] but when [we call ſuch a conception a man,] we mean by *man* only the *ſpecies*, and ſo this cannot be other then a man, let [all the occurrences] that you can ſpeak of, or imagine, [interpoſe to hinder it.] Now

4. Albeit [there be many occurrences which may hinder a conception to become a man,] *completely formed*, and much more [of full ſtature;] yet can no occurrences hinder that life which is eternal, as you ſpeak [*in ſemine*, or *fieri*,] from becoming eternal, as you muſt learnedly phraſe in *facto eſſe*: the reaſon is, Becauſe God in his ordinary Providence, leaves many ſuch *conceptions* to prove *abortions*; but he hath been pleaſed to engage himſelf by many gracious promiſes to imploy his Power and Wiſdom, to preſerve every one, in whom he hath put the *ſeed of eternal life*, from [all adverſary occurrences whatſoever] and to *keep them unto his heavenly kingdom*. Now Sir,

5. Albeit a *Conception* may be hindered from becoming a man of complete ſtature, yet a humane ſoul, as ſoon as it is created, is *immortal*, and [all the occurrences] in the world, cannot make it *Mortal*, but it will, in ſpight of them all, continue to *eternity*: And ſo this *ſeed* we ſpeak of, is *incorruptible*, and all the powers in earth or hell, cannot poſſibly obſtruct its duration to eternity. The *ſoul* is ſo far immortal (I confeſs) in its *own nature*, as that nothing can deſtroy it, but *God alone*: but this *ſeed* is *incorruptible*, meerly through the *good pleaſure of God* to preſerve it, elſe were *every thing* in the world enough to *deſtroy* it: but we need no greater ſecurity then Gods bare pleaſure to maintain it.

I come laſtly to examine the reſult of your Diſcourſe in this Paragraph, which you ſay, [amounts clearly to this, that our Saviour in the words in hand, doth not oppoſe the *life* which comes by *drinking his water*, to the *life of Nature*, in reſpect of the imperfect condition of it in this world; but in reſpect of the *future* and *complete* growth of it in the world to come.] Let him do ſo: What follows? that he who *drinks of this water*, ſhall have *life eternal*; though [*imperfect* in this world,] yet perfect in the world to come; but *eternal*, as well *now* as *then*. For it is *then*, in the world to come, eternal only *negatively*, in that it ſhall never have an *end*: nor ſhall it ever have an *end* after once it hath a *beginning* in this *world*, and ſo hath a good right to the Title of *Eternal*. This Conſequence trips up the heels of all you have done in this learned Section.

SECT. 12. 2. Say you, [When he ſaith; That *the waters which he ſhall give him, ſhall be a well of water ſpringing up*, &c. His meaning is not, as if either the Doctrine or the Spirit which he gives unto men, and they drink, ſhould alwayes, actually, neceſſarily, and infallibly, end, or iſſue in eternal life, properly and completely ſo called, the Scriptures teſtifying in many places the contrary of both; but that their natural courſe and tendency alwaies ſtand that way; as the courſe, motion, and inclination of waters in a River alwayes ſtand bent towards the Sea, though they may by force be turned out of their channel, or dryed up by the violent and ſcorching heat of the Sun.]

I anſwer, That Chriſts meaning, is no leſs, then that the Doctrine and Spirit, which he ſhall give, ſhall alwayes bring the men to whom he gives it, at laſt to the kingdome of Heaven; nor do the Scriptures which you alledg in the Margent, teſtifie any thing to the contrary. *Matth.*13.20,22. ſpeaks only of his *Doctrine*, not of his *Spirit*. *Mark* 6.20. ſpeaks only of *Johns Doctrine*, nothing of *Chriſts Spirit*;

Spirit, which when you ſhall ſhew me that *Herod ever had*, I ſhall moſt willingly cry *peccavi*: And ſo if you ſhall demonſtrate that *Simon Magus* had the *Spirit of Chriſt*, *Act.*8.13. *Simon Magus* his *belief*, and *Herods hearing John gladly*, amount to no proof of it. *Herod* might be pleaſed with many Truths which *John* delivered, agreeable to the light of Nature; *Simon Magus* might believe the Apoſtles Doctrine, for the Hiſtorical part of it, upon a conſideration of the Miracles which they did, beyond the power of Nature; neither attained to true faith in Chriſt, which alwayes carries in it a *relyance on him for Salvation*, with a *reſigning up of our ſelves unto him*. Thoſe in *Heb.*6 4,5. &c. had but *common and inferior gifts*, not the *Saving Graces of the Spirit*; they might *taſte the Powers of the world to come*, and go ſo far as they did, without true *Sanctifying Grace*. And of this I have elſewhere given an account, in my Anſwer to your eighth Chapter, and ſhall again do it more largely, when I come to examine your Expoſition of this Text, which you here only point at.

As for your *Simile* of [the waters in a River, whoſe courſe always ſtands bent to the Sea, though they may be interrupted by being turned out of their channel, or dryed up by the Sun.] I muſt tell you, that the courſe of the *River* is *accidental*, but the *Waters* in the Text have an *eſſential* property to *quench thirſt*, and eſpecially when there is a *well* of them, *Rivers* of them *flowing out of a mans belly*, that man cannot *thirſt*. But this is the caſe of *theſe waters*, ſee *John* 17.38, where Chriſt ſaith, the *Scripture ſaith* ſo; as it doth ſpeak, though not in *expreſs termes* in any one place, yet to this *purpoſe* in many. See *Iſai.*44.3. and 49.10. *Joel* 3.18 *Zech.*14.8. *Iſai.*55.10. *Joel* 2.28. And thus there appears a promiſe in this Scripture of ſuch a Perſeverance of the Saints, as is commonly notioned amongſt us, all that your Learning hath hitherto oppoſed, notwithſtanding; and ſome would have ſaid, you have been very *dry* upon theſe *waters*, and made but a hungry diſcourſe upon this thirſt. —*Repetunt quas perdunt Belides undas.*

SECT. 13. You ſet your ſelf againſt another Text alledged by us, to prove a promiſe of Perſeverance to the Saints, *John* 14.16. *And I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.* To evacuate this Scripture, you think fit to ſignifie

[1. That evident it is, that our Saviour doth not in this place oppoſe the abiding or remaining of the Holy Ghoſt, to his *own diſceſſion or departure* from the hearts or ſouls of men, into which he is entered or come; but to his departure out of the *world by death*, which was now at hand.]

Very [evident,] and I think all as [evident,] that it makes nothing at all to your purpoſe. Chriſt in this place ſhewes that he will never depart out of thoſe *ſouls* into which he is entred, but that his Spirit ſhall ſtill remaine in thoſe mens *hearts*, albeit his body be removed from their *eyes*: and he gives this as a comfort to them, that he will ſtill be with them by his *Spirit*, which alone ſupports them, albeit his *body* (whoſe *fleſh* cannot profit them in any way comparable to his *Spirit*, which is that which only *quickens*) be tranſlated from them. Chriſt in this place endeavors to ſhew, his Diſciples will be no loſers by his *Departure*, and that did they conſider both the continuance of his *Spiritual preſence* with them, and the *happy increaſe* of both the Graces and Comforts which they ſhould enjoy by that Spirit of his, which now he would ſend them, in this reſpect in a more *eminent way*, they would look upon his *departure* as matter of *joy* rather then *ſorrow*, it being ſo *neceſſary for them that he go away, for elſe the Comforter would not come*, John 16.7.

2. You proceed, [Therefore by the *abiding of the Comforter*, or Holy Ghoſt, *with them for ever*, he doth not mean his perpetual, or uninterruptible reſidence, or abode in their hearts and ſouls, or in the heart and ſoul of any other particular man determinately; but his conſtant abiding in the *world*, in and with the Goſpel and the children thereof until the conſummation and end of it; in reſpect of

which permanency of his Spirit, he ſaith of himſelf elſewhere; *And lo I am with you alwaies unto the end of the world.*]

But I pray, 1. Did not the Spirit keep his perpetual reſidence in the Apoſtles? and did not Chriſt promiſe them that he ſhould? *He dwelleth with you*, and ſhall be with you, ver.17, and if for *any time* he ſhould ceaſe to *be in them*, ſo long I think, they ſhould be *comfortleſs*, ver.18. and if he ſhould ceaſe at *laſt to be in them*, then (I conceive) could not that promiſe be made good, *Te ſhall live alſo*, ver.19. which yet Chriſt makes as ſure as his *own life*; *Becauſe I live, ye ſhall live alſo.* I ſee the Apoſtles had more need to have their *hearts troubled*, ver. 1. then we are wont to conceive; yea, notwithſtanding all the variety of non-concludent Arguments, which Chriſt uſeth to put them out of their reaſonable, and juſt melancholly; after all his *preparing a place for them*, ver.2. and his promiſe *to come again and receive them unto himſelf, that where he is, there they may be alſo*, ver.3. How might the poor men moſt unhappily miſcarry, as having [no promiſe that the Spirit ſhould make his perpetual and uninterrupted reſidence with them;] and then, though Chriſt *prepared a place for them*, they would not be *prepared for the place*; and though he *came again to receive them*, they would *reject him*; and as ſure as *death*, then they could not *live*; his *life* could not preſerve them from *eternal death*, yea, though they ſhould be enabled to *do the works that Chriſt himſelf did*; yea, *and greater works then theſe*, ver.12. yet they would commit evil works enough to bar them for ever out of the *Manſions* above; and though Chriſt promiſe, *That he and his Father will come and make their abode with them*, ver.23. and *that Chriſt will manifeſt himſelf to them*, ver. 21. and laſtly, that *they ſhall know at that day, that Chriſt is in his Father, and they in him, and he in them*; yet theſe *branches* would be all broken off as *unprofitable*, and caſt in bundels together into *unquenchable fire*; eſpecially conſidering that if the Spirit did not make his [perpetual and uninterrupted reſidence among them,] then during the time of his progreſs from them, the day of his death, which alas, ſaith Mr. *Goodwin*, [is not determined by God,] may ſteal upon them as a *thief*, without giving *notice* to them, or having *warrant* from him; and then what becomes of thoſe wretched Apoſtles? in ſtead of *ſitting on throns, judging the twelve Tribes of Iſrael*, there is nothing to be expected, but that they ſhould be brought to the *Bar* as Apoſtates, the worſt ſure of all Malefactors, and accordingly receive the moſt fearful Doom. This is the miſerable comfort, which (according to Mr. *Goodwins* Expoſition) Chriſt hath given his Apoſtles in this his impertinent and unſavory Diſcourſe.

2. If Chriſt [meant not that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould keep his perpetual or uninterruptible reſidence or abode in the hearts of his Apoſtles, or any other particular man determinately, and yet ſhould keep a conſtant abode in the world, in, and with the Goſpel unto the end.] It ſeems he meant he ſhould take up *new quarters*, as his occaſions ſhould ſerve him, from one place to another. But I pray tell me, if he were pleaſed at any time to remove from an old houſe to a new; Was he not like to find the *new* worſe furniſhed then the *old*? and ſhould he not be at more charge either to build, or at leaſt to furniſh the *new*, which had been ever before his coming, a naſty, blind doghole, then to repair and cleanſe the *old*? which ſure he wanted not power to do at his pleaſure. And if the ſins of thoſe in whom he had dwelt cauſed him to remove, he ſhould find enough in thoſe whither he went to ſettle, to deter him from pitching there, it being as uncertain, after all his coſt, but that he ſhould be fain to forſake *that* too in time. Sir, he that was [*to continue alwayes in the world,*] was to continue in thoſe whom God had *choſen out of the world*; and conſtantly to abide in his *Temples*, as the Saints are called, not Tabernacles or Tents, for ought that I can at preſent remember. Well, but to put our Saviours words into more plainneſs.

You ſay, [They ſound as if he had ſpoken thus, Gods purpoſe in ſending me, into the world, required that I ſhould make no long ſtay or abode in it, but that I ſhould return by the way of death unto him again, and accordingly I am now upon

upon my returne, but I will intercede for you, and he will ſend you another Comforter, the Holy Ghoſt, not to be taken out of the world by *death*, as I muſt be, but to make his reſidence among you, my Friends and Faithful ones for ever.] So then it ſeems Chriſt intended only to indoctrinate his Diſciples in this grand myſtery, that *the Holy Ghoſt was not to dy*. What man alive, but had need of a whole Chapter to fortifie him againſt the great fear of the Holy Ghoſts dying, and having all his hopes buried at laſt in the Comforters grave? This is the drift of our Saviour, as this profound Mr. *Goodwin* is pleaſed, [moſt plainly to repreſent it] to us. A whole Hecatomb is not enough for you to ſacrifice to your Genius for ſo rare a diſcovery of this deep myſtery. ἰυγκαι. Onward, and

3. You tell us, [That this promiſe concerning the abiding of this other Comforter for ever, muſt be conceived to be made either to the Apoſtles, perſonally conſidered, or elſe to the whole body of the Church, of which they were principal members: but to neither: for 1. If the firſt of theſe be admitted, then it will not follow, That becauſe the Apoſtles had the perpetual reſidence of the Spirit with them and in them, therefore every particular Believer hath the like; no more then it will follow, That becauſe the Apoſtles were infallible in their judgments and Doctrine; *ergo*, Every Believer is infallible upon the ſame account alſo.]

I anſwer, There is not the ſame reaſon for the perpetual *reſidence* of the Holy Ghoſt, and the infallible *guidance* of the Holy Ghoſt: the *latter* was *proper* to the Apoſtles, becauſe of their *proper function*, in order to the *Salvation of others*: the *former* is common to all Believers, becauſe of their *common intereſt* in the *favor* of God for their *owne Salvation*. God hath appointed *all Believers to Salvation*; and to bring them to Heaven, the *perpetual reſidence* of the Holy Ghoſt in them is neceſſary: He hath not appointed *all Believers* to be *Preachers*, nor *all Preachers* to be *Apoſtles*, and ſo no ſuch *infallible guidance* of the Spirit is neceſſary for them; yea, it is neceſſary for them to ſee their weakneſs and aptneſſe to *err*, and ſo ſome *miſtakes* make for the keeping them the more *humble*, and by depreſſing their ſpirits, contribute to their *Exaltation* in due time.

[2. If the latter be admitted, neither will it follow that every Believer muſt needs have the Spirits reſidence with him for ever. There are priviledges appropriate to corporations, which every member of them cannot claim: The Church may have the reſidence or preſence of the Spirit of God with her for ever, and yet every preſent Member hereof loſe his preſent intereſt and part in him.]

I anſwer, That this is ſuch a priviledg as cannot be aſſerted to be in the *Church*, but that it muſt be aſſerted to be in *every particular member*, I mean, *true Believer*; for where ſhall the Spirit keep his conſtant reſidence but in *ſuch*? and why it ſhould leave *ſome* which it hath made true Believers, to ſojourn with others which may ſoon turn *unbelievers*, none but Mr. *Goodwins* unparallell'd Acumen is in a capacity either to demonſtrate or apprehend. And further, if the meaning be, that [the Holy Ghoſt ſhould keep his conſtant reſidence in no particular Member of the Church,] then [no particular Member of the Church] ſhould continue a Member of the Church; and ſo [no particular Member of the Church] on earth, ſhould be determinately appointed to a place in Heaven: Yes, that is it you intend, as appears by your cloſe, [Yea, that the perpetual abiding of the Spirit in the Apoſtles themſelves, was not abſolutely promiſed unto them, appears (ſay you) from thoſe and ſuch like paſſages of our Saviour unto them, *If ye ſhall keep my Commandments, ye ſhall abide in my love*, John 15.10. *If any man love me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and will dwell with him*, John 14.23.] But (ſay I) Chriſt promiſed that *his Spirit ſhould lead them into all truth, and prayed that his Father would keep them through his own name*: And howbeit in your Texts his Spirits abiding with them, in reſpect

of *comfort* be promiſed upon *condition* of their keeping his Commandments, yet his Spirits abiding with them, in reſpect of *Grace*, and aſſiſtance to keep his Commandments, which is the condition of their *comfort*, is promiſed *abſolutely*; nor (I hope) did their *love to Chriſt*, lead Chriſts *love to them*, but his love to them, their love to him. We who are but of the loweſt form of Believers, have no reaſon to be too much offended with you for abridging our priviledges, ſeeing you have a Commiſſion (it ſeems) to be thus bold with the very Apoſtles.

4. And laſtly, you tell us of [notice formerly given of the importance of this Particle *Iva*, *ut*, *that*, that it ſignifies not the certainty of the event, no not when ſpeech is of God himſelf, but oft-times the intention of the agent, *Chap.* 10 *Sect.* 50,53] I refer the Reader to my Anſwer there.

And whereas you ſay, [In this Dialect of ſpeech, thoſe words, *That he may abide with you for ever*, do not imply an abſolute neceſſity of his abiding with them; but only that that ſhould be the intent of him that ſhould ſend him, and that he would ſend him in ſuch a way, that if they were true to their own intereſt in ſo weighty a matter, and proportionably careful, they might retain him, and have his abode and preſence with them for ever.]

I muſt deſire leave to tell you this, Your [Dialect] is not too Dialectical. For what is this, that [he would ſend his Spirit, that if they were true to their own intereſt, and proportionably careful, they might retain his preſence?] What but *his preſence* could make them thus *true* and *careful?* It is the *Spirit* that was to *keep* them thus *true* and *careful*, not their *Truth* and *carefulneſs* that was to *retain the Spirit*. You very fairly here attribute, as you ſeldome forget to do any where, all the *preſence of the Spirit* to mens own *good deportment*; not their good deportment to the Spirit; ſo humbly do you ſing, *Non nobis Domine, non nobis ſed Nomini tuo.*

SECT. 15. You only tell us how well [you have evinced, *John* 5.24. and 3,36. and 6.57. innocent from all compliance with the common Doctrine of Perſeverance, Heterodoxly ſirnamed Orthodox, *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* 52. and *Chap. Praf. Sect.* 1, & 9.] And I ſhall think it enough to reply, That I have ſhewed how indignly you have handled thoſe Scriptures, and that when you ſhall have pleaded your beſt, your Doctrine of Apoſtaſie, as common as it may perhaps grow among ſuch who are guilty of Apoſtaſie in their practiſe, will ſtill be Orthodoxly ſirnamed Heterodox.

SECT. 16. Our ſecond Argument, you ſay, is [built upon ſuch Texts which affirm and teach, That God will, according to his promiſe, ſo preſerve and keep all true Believers, that none of them ſhall ever fall away from their faith, either totally or finally.] And I pray, if theſe [Texts affirm and teach ſo,] who but Mr. *Goodwin*, a better Teacher, lately fallen from Heaven, may take upon him to [affirm and teach] the contrary? mend it in your next Edition, thus, which *ſeem* to affirm and teach. [From the Apoſtle *Paul*, we furniſh our ſelves (ſay you) with ſuch Texts as theſe; *Who* (ſpeaking of Jeſus Chriſt) *ſhall alſo confirme you unto the end, that ye may be blameleſs in the day of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. God is faithful, by whom ye were called*, 1 Cor. 8.9. Again, *But the Lord is faithful, who ſhall alſo eſtabliſh you and keep you from evil*, 2 Theſſ. 3.3. That neither of theſe Scriptures, nor any of like character, hath any communion with the Doctrine of Perſeverance, hath been (you boaſt) ſufficiently proved already, *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* 20. where the paſſages themſelves were briefly opened,] ſo hath your opening been ſufficiently detected of hiding many a fair abſurdity in it.) You add that [a clear ſenſe hath been rendred, wherein God may be ſaid, according to Scripture phraſe, to *eſtabliſh and confirm men unto the end*, though theſe *men be not actually eſtabliſhed and confirmed.*]

The Scripture phraſe hath been ſhewed to be *groſly darkned* by your [clear ſenſe;] and if we may take liberty to borrow a ſhred of your language, this [may be every

mans

mans vision,] though it be rather a *dream*. To ſave the charge of repetition, I humbly deſire the Reader to reflect on what I have ſaid to this purpoſe, and ſhall only mind him at preſent, how worthy notions you have of God, who (you pretend) [may be ſaid to effect, becauſe he intends and gives means ſufficient:] and yet when he intends, and accordingly gives out theſe ſufficient means, he is not (according to you) ſure to effect what he intends, nor can be, unleſs men pleaſe to be ſo propitious to his intentions, as to contribute their aſſiſtance, to which for the moſt part they are very difficultly induced. Well, but

[That the Apoſtle in neither of theſe places doth undertake or affirm, that God will eſtabliſh or confirm them unto the end after any ſuch manner, but that they may poſſibly miſcarry, notwithſtanding, appears from the Context it ſelf, where the latter of them ſtands; for having comforted them with the words mentioned *ver.*3. *But the Lord is faithful, who ſhall ſtabliſh you, and keep you from evil*; and profeſſed, *ver.*4. a *confidence*; *i. e.* a confident hope in the Lord touching them, that they both did, and would do the things which he commanded them, (which by the way had been a very weak ſaying, if he had known that they muſt of neceſſity do them, and could not chuſe to do otherwiſe) *ver.*5. he lifteth up this prayer for them, *And the Lord*, or *now the Lord direct your hearts into*, or *unto* (*his*) *the love of God*; and *into*, or *unto a patient waiting for Chriſt*. Doubtleſs, had he firſt abſolutely promiſed them ſuch an eſtabliſhment, and keeping them from evil by God, the ſaving ſucceſs whereof had no wayes depended upon them, nor upon any ſuch comportment on their part with it, he would not ſo immediately have conceived ſuch a prayer for them.] SECT. 17.

Here 1. Your Diſcourſe hath ſo ſtrong a ſmell in [your paſſage by the way] as a man may be offended with it a mile off, [if he had known they muſt of neceſſity do the things which he commanded them, and could not chuſe to do otherwiſe, it had (ſay you) been a weak ſaying, to profeſs his confidence, that they would do them.] We poor men, think he had ſo much the ſtronger ground for his confidence: No, ſaith Mr. *Goodwin*, [It had been a weak ſaying, to ſay he was confident they would do it, if they could not chuſe to do otherwiſe.] He (it ſeems) is confident of things *that may be otherwiſe*, that they *will be*; but of things that *cannot be otherwiſe*, he is not ſo [weak] as to allow himſelfe to profeſs a confidence that they *will be*. His confidence is wont to be mounted upon a poſſibility at leaſt, that it *may be diſappointed*. As he may (for inſtance) be confident that we ſhall have a very *bright day to morrow noon*, but is not ſure that it will be *dark* at the ordinary rate anon at *twelve a clock at night*. He is confident, it ſeems of *Will. Lillies* Predictions, which may very well not *be fulfilled*; but not ſo [weak] as to be confident of the Prophecies in Scripture, which *cannot but be fulfilled* in their due ſeaſon.

2. Here is a [doubtleſs] that betrayes ſomewhat worſe, [that *Paul* would not pray for what he had firſt abſolutely promiſed them from God.] I had thought Gods promiſes, which he had declared to the Saints, would rather have put him upon praying with the *leſs doubt*. And how I beſeech you, can you pray for any thing with aſſurance of faith, but according to the tenor of Gods promiſe? The more *abſolute* Gods *promiſe* is, the more boldneſs (I had thought) you might have uſed in your acceſſes to the Throne of Grace. Gods *Promiſes* (Reverend Sir) are the *encouragements* of our *Prayers*, they do not make our Prayers the *leſs needful*, they ſhould make them the *more fervent*. Why, but

3. [He would not have prayed to God, at leaſt in that forme, to *direct their hearts unto the love of God*, &c. conſidering that a *directing of the hearts of men*, into, or towards ſuch a courſe or way, doth not neceſſarily ſuppoſe that they therefore will, or of neceſſity muſt walk in them.] True: but doth it ſuppoſe *no neceſſity* that they ſhall, or muſt walk in them? *Directing*, it is true, doth not ſuppoſe *our walking*: but *our walking* in Gods wayes, doth neceſſarily ſuppoſe *his directing*; and God having promiſed that his *people ſhall walk in his way*, hath of courſe

course promised them *his direction* to walk in it; and therefore *Paul* had just ground to *pray for it*. Again, what if this *directing* be as much as a *making right*, κατευθύναι τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην, a *bowing* and *bending* of their crooked hearts to the love of God?

Lastly, Unless God had had *another work* to do upon their hearts, besides giving them *Exhortations*, *Paul* had indeed mispent his time in *praying* for them, and should have imployed himself wholly in *Preaching* to them: but what would all the *preaching* of *Paul* or *Apollos* either, have done, had not God graciously wrought upon their *hearts* by his own *hand*? and I hope he was *able* to work so, as to *confirme* them to the last, as well as he *converted* them at first; and *both* he doth so, as he makes them to *act*; but they are meerly *Passive* in respect of his *Grace*, albeit they work with it in all their *gracious actions*.

SECT. 18. 3. You go on, [Whereas the Apostle in both places mentioneth the faithfulness of God, *God is faithful by whom ye are called*; he doth not necessarily mean that property or attribute in him which renders him true and just, or constant in the performance of his promises; as if the Apostle in these or any the like places supposed such a promise, one or more, made by him, by which he stands obliged to stablish or confirme his Saints unto the end, by a strong and irresistible hand; but such a kind of disposition in him as is meant by *Peter*, when he stileth him a *faithful Creator*: Which supposeth] (forsooth) [no more but what the Law or relation of a Creator promiseth in a rational way unto it, which we there signified to be a great care and tenderness over it, for the preservation and wel being of every Creature respectively.]

We have hitherto considered how well you give this *Law* to the *Creator*, who is bound in *duty*, it seems, to every Creature to have such an especial [care and tenderness over it,] yea [how well this Law of Creator promiseth to every Creature in a rational way, such a care of God over it;] I dare say, *you* are the first that either took upon you to give Law to your Creator, or said [This Law promiseth so much care in a rational way to every Creature.] It seems to me a like unintelligible, how the *Creator* should have any [Law] upon him, besides his own *will*; and how any *Creature* beneath *man*, should be capable of a [promise in a rational way.] In what *rational sense* doth God promise any thing to *irrational Creatures*? Then is God said to promise [in a rational way to a Creature,] when the Creature is able in a *rational way* to collect, *That God will do a thing for it*; which how any *Creature* can do besides man, or how man can do it in any *particular* case, without a *promise* at least in *general* words from God, is well worthy the learning from Mr. *Goodwin*, from whom we humbly desire some further light in this dark business, wherein for the present we are at a loss, and apprehend not but that Gods Will, will warrant it self sufficiently to dispose of *any Creature* at its pleasure; and that no *Creature* hath *reason* to promise it self *more from God*, than what he hath *signified* it is his *will* to bestow, and that *no Creature* hath *reason* whereby to *construe* the *will* of God however *expressed*, but *man*, are to us so perspicuous *Truthes*, that we know none but the said Pirrhonical Mr. *Goodwin* would raise a *Question* about them. Surely, what that is which he owes to his *new Creatures*, and what they may *rationally* expect from him, without the encouragement of an *express promise*, is to *me*, and most of them a mystery: and I have abundantly made it good, that his *relation of a Creator*, doth no way strengthen their *Faith* in his *Love*, but that their *Faith* in his *Love* and *Faithfulness* as *Redeemer*, is confirmed by the consideration of his *Power* as their *Creator*. See *chap.* 4. *Sect.* 39. And thus hath God engaged his *own power* to keep his *new Creatures*, not as you word it for us, [But that if they be careless and negligent of themselves, they may be shaken, decline, and commit evil, notwithstanding,] which by too frequent experience they all find they daily do; but *that they shall not be so*, [careless and negligent,] as to be *shaken* off, *decline* to a *final impenitence*, or commit evil without *sorrow* and *shame*, and a holy *revenge* upon themselves, and that their

their very *careleſneſs* and *negligence*, and ſhall prove an occaſion and incentive to their greater *care* and *diligence* for the future. And whereas you adde.

4. And laſtly, [That by the tenor of other paſſages from the ſame Apoſtles pen and upon like occaſion, where he expreſſeth the care and diligence of the Saints to co-operate and joyn with God and his grace by way of condition, to their eſtabliſhment to the end; it fully appears, that all ſuch promiſes are conditional, and that the performance of them is ſuſpended upon the ſaid voluntary conjunction or co-operation of the Saints themſelves with him.]

I anſwer, That the *eſtabliſhment* of the Saints, is indeed [ſuſpended] upon ſuch a conditon; but that *condition* is a *part* of what God *promiſed*, and that he hath engaged *himſelf* to make them [voluntarily co-operate with him,] their *co-operation* is nothing the leſs *theirs*, becauſe it is wrought *in them* by *him*, the *will* and the *deed* they have from his *good pleaſure*, who though he find them meerly *paſſive* in reſpect of the *habit* of Grace which is the *firſt*, yet makes them by that grace, *active* in *all* holy *works*, but ſo, as that they humbly acknowledge, they have neither *deſire* nor *thought* of them, without Gods *eſpecial infuſion of it*. That of *Colloſſ.*1.22,23, of Chriſts *preſenting you unblameable and unreproveable in his ſight, if ye continue in the faith*, ſounds nothing contradictory to this, that *you continue in the faith only by Gods grace*; or that *by Gods grace you ſhall ſo continue*, it only repreſents the *connexion* between *his preſenting them unblameable and unreprovable*, and *their continuing in the faith*; that without *continuing in the faith*, they ſhall *not* be *preſented ſo*; that *continuing in the faith*, they *ſhall be preſented ſo*. But *doubtfulneſs* of their *continuing in the faith*, it ſuggeſts not. True, in regard of the *particular men*, there was *no certainty* that they were more then *profeſſors*, *true Believers*; and ſo *no certainty* that they would *continue* in the *faith* which they only *profeſſed*: And *this* that he *knew not certainly* that they were *Elect*, is a juſt cauſe for him to *ſpeak ſo cautelouſly*, *if you continue*. But as for the *general*, that *true Believers ſhould continue*, ſo as to be *preſented unblameable and unreproveable in his ſight*, is that which the Apoſtle might according to the tenor of his Doctrine have confidently affirmed without *ifs and ands*. [That of *Heb.*3.14. *For we are made partakers of Chriſt* (ſpeaking to a Church) *if we hold the beginning of our confidance ſtedfaſt unto the end*,] is of the ſame conſideration; nor doth it *ſuſpend* their continuance unto the end upon their own *endeavors*, but *implies* the *connexion* as formerly, between *their continuance in faith unto the end*, and *entrance into glory without end*; ſtill reſolving all into *this*, That he *who begun this good work*, *muſt have the glory of perfecting it*; and be in all thankfulneſs acknowledge to be as the *beginner*, ſo the *perfecter* of their faith. So that hitherto there is nothing ſaid by you to prove the Saints Title to Heaven ſo uncertain, as that they are in any ſuch great [danger of diſinheriting by their ſlothfulneſs and unworthineſs.] True, *theſe* are *enough* to endanger it, and that *inevitably*; but God hath engaged himſelf to preſerve them from ſuch [ſlothfulneſs and unworthineſs,] and every evil way unto his Heavenly Kingdom.

SECT. 19.

You fall now to another Text, by which you ſay [the Argument now ſhaking] (you ſhould have ſaid, *ſhivering* for very fear, though it have hitherto received no inſufferable *hurt*) [is ſuppoſedly ſtrengthened by that of the Apoſtle, 1 Cor.10. 13. *There hath no temptation taken you, but ſuch as is common unto men; but God is faithful who will not ſuffer you to be tempted above that ye are able, but will with the temptation alſo make a way to eſcape, that ye may be able to bear it.* You anſwer,

1. [That this Scripture notably confirmes your interpretation and explication, lately given of the faithfulneſs of God, where ever it is aſſerted upon the occaſion mentioned; *viz.* That it ſignifies or imports ſuch a carefulneſs or reſpectfulneſs in him towards his Saints, which anſwers the nature and termes of ſuch a relation, which accrues to him by making himſelf the Founder, Father, or Author of this

new

new being of Saintſhip unto them, and withal, which anſwers the nature and condition of ſuch Creatures or perſons. Now ſuch a love or reſpectfulneſs in God towards the perſons we ſpeak of, which expreſſeth its ſelf in vouchſafing unto them a liberal and bountiful ſufficiency of means, for, and towards the perpetual preſervation of themſelves in well being, fully anſwers both the nature and import of the ſaid relation, as alſo the frame and condition of theſe new Creatures; with whoſe frame, or ſtate, and manner of being, *viz.* as they are men, it well conſiſts, that they ſhould have all things requiſite and neceſſary for their happineſs and well being, both preſent and future, ſupplyed unto them by God; but not to be ſimply and abſolutely, or by a forcible and ſtrong hand neceſſitated to uſe them in order hereunto.]

If your Explication of the faithfulneſs of God have no more [notable confirmation] then that which this Text will give it, it is not ſo likely to ſtand as our weak Doctrine, notwithſtanding all your moſt mighty [ſhaking] of it. For

1. Your pretended [love and reſpectfulneſs of God to the Saints,] owed them belike [by his Relation of new Creator to them] is ſuch as we know no reaſon to own. We are ſure this Text doth not; here is not one ſyllable that ſounds to this purpoſe; nor indeed doth God owe more upon this account to his *new Creatures*, then to any of the *old*: What? is he *indebted* to them the more by *giving* them more? I never heard till now that his *bounty bound* him in any ſuch *obligation*: They are the more *indebted to him*, the more they *receive from him*; but how his *free gift* ſhould entangle him in a *bond*, and contract a *debt* upon him, is that for which I will be your *bond-man* if ever you diſcharge your ſelf as becomes you, in proving it.

2. Why doth [it not well conſiſt with theſe new Creatures, as they are men, to be ſimply, abſolutely, or by a forcible and ſtrong hand neceſſitated to uſe means, in order to their happineſs?] What wot you? When they were made *new Creatures*, were they not [ſimply, abſolutely, by a forcible and ſtrong hand neceſſitated] to be ſuch? That God uſed a [ſtrong hand, you muſt *confeſs*; that he uſed a [forcible one,] you ſhould not *deny*: had he not *forced* out the *old man*, as it were *Vi & Armis*, he would never have quitted his *poſſeſſion*. Believe it, he is too crafty to be *complemented* out of doors. As the *Kingdome of Heaven ſuffers*, ſo it is fain to *offer violence*, or elſe it never erects it ſelf in *any mans heart*; it will not ſtoop to take up *Chriſts yoak*, no not to kiſs his *Scepter*, till it be *overpowred*; and would chuſe, if left to it ſelf, rather to *break* then *bow*. You will quarrel perhaps ſtill, and ſay [it is not neceſſitated.] But we humbly conceive, that is *leſs* then to be *forced*; and if it be not *neceſſitated*, then it *freely conſents to its change*. Now I ask, Whether it be the *Unregenerate* or the *Regenerate* part that *ſo conſents?* not the *Unregenerate*, for that is ſtill an implacable enemy to it; not the *Regenerate*, for that *ſuppoſeth a change already made*. It remaines therefore that in the *firſt inſtant* wherein the *new Creature is made*, it is made ſo by *neceſſity*, without yeilding the *leaſt compliance*, and is meerly *Paſsive*, not *active* in *this change*. Now Sir, if it be not [inconſiſtent with the nature of men] to be *made new Creatures*, why ſhould it be inconſiſtent with it to be *kept* in this condition? And if it be not [inconſiſtent with the nature of men,] to be brought at *firſt* into this happy condition, *without the uſe of means on their part*, why ſhould it be inconſiſtent with it to *be kept in the uſe of means*, that they may be kept in *this happy*, and *prepared* for a *more happy condition*? And why, for all the world, ſhould it [not be conſiſtent with the nature of man] for God to be *ſo gracious* to them as in *his faithfulneſs to preſerve them to eternal happineſs*, whereas if they were left to themſelves to uſe means as they think good, they would ſoon *betray themſelves to eternal miſery*?

Now go on with your Explication, [Accordingly the Holy Ghoſt in the words before us, expreſly teſtifieth on the behalf of God, *That he will not ſuffer them to be tempted above what they are able*; that is, he will afford them a ſufficiency of means to ſtand it out againſt all temptations whatſoever that ſhall be permitted by

by him to befal them; not that he *will not ſuffer them to be tempted* above what they ſhall be *willing* to *overcome*, or keep themſelves *upright* under, nor that *he will not ſuffer them to be overcome.*]

Anſwer, 1. That my weakneſs underſtands not how thoſe words, *He will not ſuffer them to be tempted above what they are able*, do ſignifie, [That he will afford them a ſufficiency of means, or ſtrength to ſtand it out againſt all temptations that he ſhall permit to befal them;] they ſeem to me to ſignifie, that he will not ſuffer *other temptations* to befal them, then *what* they ſhall be ſupplied with *ſufficient ſtrength* to *bear*; and expreſs a *reſtraint* of the *temptation*, more then an *affording of ſtrength to the tempted.*

2. They ſeem to me to ſignifie, That *God will not ſuffer them to be tempted above what they ſhall be willing to overcome, or keep themſelves upright under.* For ſurely their *ability* in this caſe, will make little for their *comfort*, (the thing aimed at in this expreſſion:) if it be not ſeconded with *their will to overcome the temptations*; yea, the *more ability* they have, if their *will* be not correſpondent, the *leſs* will they be able to *comfort themſelves* upon any rational ground, and the *more* will they be liable to be *condemned by God*: So that theſe words clearly carry it, that God will both *moderate the temptations*, and *enable the tempted*, which is eſpecially done by *holding up their hearts*, to ſtand upright under the heavieſt load that ſhall lye upon them. Sir, the *will* of man being the faculty moſt *flexible* of all the reſt, and moſt *apt to bend*, ſtands moſt in need of a *prop* and *ſupporter*. Alas, when the *reaſon* is able to *repel* the temptation, yet the *will* is too apt to *comply* with it; and being a *blind faculty*, albeit it cannot find out the *right way of it ſelf*, but as it is conducted by the *Underſtanding*, yet is it too apt to *fall into the ditch*, even when the *Underſtanding* would lead it a *due diſtance from it*; it is apt to *ſtumble* in the *plaineſt* way, and where the *Underſtanding* diſcernes no *ſtones*, whereof to give it *warning*; it *ſpurnes* ever and anon even at a *ſtraw* or *ruſh*: nothing leſs then *Gods own hand*, leading and ſupporting this *dark faculty*, is able, to make it either *walk* or *ſtand upright*, when a man hath no other temptation, but that of *its own innate frowardneſs or feebleneſs*, lying as a *burthen* upon him. The very *ſtoutneſs* of the *will* renders it *unable to bear* many a temptation: it cannot *bear*, becauſe it will not *bend*; and ſo it *falls*, becauſe it will not *ſtoop*; the greateſt difficulty is to be able to *maſter our will*, which maſters *all* the *other faculties*, and puts *ſome* of them on tasks of *inſuperable labour*, upon no other *ground* but its *pleaſure*; and they without ſo much as *grudging* at its commands, even pride themſelves in *tiring and ſpending* out themſelves in its ſervice. The *Eye*, though never ſo *ſleepie*, is not weary of *watching*, while it may gratifie the *will* with *looking* on that in which ſhe takes more *eſpecial pleaſure*. The *hands* and *feet* ſeldome complaine of any *drudgery*, where they find that the *Will* is not *ſatisfied without it*; yea, where the *Will* ſtands by, and bids hold out, the *weakeſt part of the body* ſtands *bolt upright* under the moſt cumberſome *preſſures*. The *Face* takes no offence let *ſpittle* or *flegme* ſhowr never ſo thick on it: The *Back* is as well contented, let *bloud* ſtream down never ſo great a *torrent* on it; the *Scourge* and the *Sword*, the *Rack* and the *Pinſers*, all are but ſo many *Playes*, as long as the *Will* looks on with *applauſe*, and bids them *endure and contemn them*: Yea, when the *Will* is pleaſed to bid the *weakeſt faculties bear up*, how do they advance above the ſphere of their uſual activity, to an unexpected and admired height? Who hath not heard how *this very Will* hath inſpired *thoſe wits* which lay groveling on the *ground*, and never looked higher then a Country imployment, ſo as to enable them to apply themſelves with a rare dexterity, to the managing of all the moſt important Affairs in Churches and States? What rare *Preachers* hath this ſame *Will* made *Extempore*, without calling in any help of their *Intellectuals* to furniſh them for the work? What ready *Juſticers* hath the ſame *Will* made, without ever troubling any of their *Senſes* in being exerciſed to *diſcerne between good and evil*, and yet enabling them to determine moſt judiciouſly, ere they could have opportunity to examine the cauſe? *Sic volo, ſic jubeo, ſtat pro ratione voluntas.*

The *Will* is *all in all*; to *make her yeild* when she is stubbornly *set* on ought, is that which *God only* can do: to make men *willing*, is to make them *able* to do many things *above* their *strength* in *Naturals*, and much more in *Spirituals*; where the bare *willing* is accepted, as *working*.

For a Conclusion, you think fit to tell us, [That your sense or notion of Gods faithfulness, is not any whit differing from what Mr, *Calvin* himself conceiveth upon the place: *The Apostle* (saith he) *calleth God Faithful, not only because he is true in his Promises; but it is, as if he should say, The Lord is a certain keeper of those that are his; under whose tuition you are in safety, for he never leaveth his destitute; therefore when he hath once received you into his care or trust, there is no cause why ye should fear, in case you depend wholly upon him.*]

What could have been said more expresly for the comfort of Believers upon the grounds of our *Doctrine of Perseverance*, then that which our Reverend *Calvin* saith in these words? the last clause is that of which alone you can take advantage, and yet even that which makes fairly against you. *Calvin* in this clause puts in a Caveat against your Conceit of *our own contributions to the work of Perseverance*; and shewes that God will keep us only, *in case we depend wholly upon him. Non est quod timeatis modo pendeatis toti ab ipso.* This *modo* is to take off from *our depending on any thing in our selves*; it doth *no way lessen our hopes of Gods constant support of us*, as being *certus custos*, but in such case as *we wholly commit our selves to his custody*; and he *makes* those that are *his* to *do so*. Did *his keeping us* depend on *our keeping our selves*, we did more depend on *our selves* then *him*, and *owed our selves* especially for all we *receive from him*.

2. Therefore say you, [For those words, *But will with the temptation make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it*: they do not imply, that God will make such a way for their escape, from under temptation, that they shall, and must necessarily bear it; *viz.* without falling under it, or miscarrying by it; but *that they may be able to bear it*, without *suffering any such loss or misery by it*, and make an escape from under it in due time.]

I answer, *They are not able to bear it, unless God do all for them.* Let him give them what ever *abilities*, without the *continual* influence of his *Grace*, those *abilities* will be *unable* to bear it. A man left to himself with the greatest *Endowments*, will quickly shew himself miserably qualified for *such a work*.

[Well, but this Exposition is confirmed by our English Divines themselves in their Annotations upon the place, *common or incident to man*; *i. e.* (say they) *Such as usually befalleth men, even Gods dearest children; or such as may be born by man in this life, especially assisted by Gods grace, which is alwayes sufficient for Gods children.* That which is *alwayes sufficient*, is not necessarily at any time *efficient*, as to the actual production of that for which it *sufficeth*; and that which *may be born* by man without inconvenience, may also possibly be an *occasion of evil* unto him]

Right; and so may these *temptations*, as *portable* as they are; nor doth this Scripture say, *That ye may be able to bear it* [*without inconvenience*,] sweating and shrinking under it, going somewhat the more weakly now and then. All these too often happen to the *best Saints*, yea, not without *falling* under it, but without *lying* under it, so as *not to rise again*. And that which is *sufficient* in this kind, is no less then what is *efficient*; *viz.* a work on their *wills*; which alone is enough to make them *sufficient* to bear it; nor doth it make them *sufficient*, but by being it self *efficient*. God saith he, *Will with the temptation make a way to escape it*. I ask, are these Saints (when God suffers the temptation) willing to escape, or no? If you say *not*, then are they *not Saints*: if they *be*, then having a *way* made with the *temptation*, they are *stil willing to escape it*; and if they be *willing* and the *way open* for their escape; what reason can you alledge why they perhaps may not *escape*? Are their *wills* to be supposed wanting upon the sudden, when the *way* is before them? or is God so careful for the *opening* of the *way*, and yet *shuts* up his hand, so as not to lend his help to them, who are supposed willing with all humble

humble thanks to accept it? Doth he who makes a *way to escape*, shew so much power in breaking downe *Obstacles without*, and so little love, as to leave them under *Obstructions within*? Doth he perhaps *turne* the *wills* of the *Persecuters*, or *Seducers*? And doth he leave those of his *Saints* (which are more pliable) to miscarry for want of keeping them right? What comfort is this to a poor Saint? *God will with the temptation make a way to escape*, but he will perhaps leave me to mine own *fears*, which will keep me from *escaping*, upon pretence of a *Lion in the way*; and when he hath shewed *all his power and providence*, I shall lose *all the benefit of it*, (alas how soon?) by mine own *weakness* and *inconsiderateness*: If God would shew his *love*, and give me *comfort of value*, let him bee pleased to work on my poore *heart*, which hee can lead on safely enough in the *difficultest* way, and which without him, will miscarry in the *fairest*.

3. And lastly, say you, [The Exhortation or Dehortation immediately following, *Wherefore my dearly Beloved, flee from Idolatry*; plainly sheweth, that there is no absolute Promise from God concerning their safe bringing off from their temptation, intended by the Apostle in the words. The mention of such a Promise is no proper motive to that duty, which he requires of them in that Exhortation, but rather a Temptation from it.]

Alas, Mr, *Goodwin*, how great a stranger do you here seem to the working of Gods Promises on the hearts of his Children! They set on no work but in the *strength of these Promises*; that he *will do it in them*, is their *incouragement to do it*. Hence it is they *flee from Idolatry*, because they trust on God, who hath promised to *take the Idols out of their heart*; and they flee to God in their *Prayers* to make good this *Promise*. I wonder whether *Paul* were tempted to any evil work by his confidence in Gods Promise, that *he would keep him from every evil work*. If so, sure God had better left him without this *dangerous Promise*, which was like to prove so *unhappy a temptation to it*. Do you conceive, that Gods Promise to *change the hearts of his people*, is a [temptation to them] from *cleansing themselves from all filthiness of the flesh and Spirit*? "Good Sir, I hope their *Prayers* are *helps* to this *Cleansing*; Gods *Promises* are the *sole helps* of their *Prayers*; so far are they from being [temptations from their duty.] The *Exhortations* are helps to this *cleansing*; Gods *Promises* are the chief *Motives* backing these *Exhortations*. How inconsiderately, according to the tenor of your profound reasonings, hath God all along made Promises to us to do the same things which he by his precepts commands us to do? I see the holy Scriptures, and your learneder Writings were not calculated to the same Meridian; nor were the Apostles stiles and yours touched with the same Magnet, as standing to quite contrary Points of the Compass. And now

Vos soboles Scribarum, Emersi ex aquore nigro,
Consecraretis Calamum Magnetis ad aras.

[Another place presents it self (as you say) upon the same account, but is presently turned off] by you as an incompetent proof. [It is that of *Paul*, 1 *Thes.* 5.23. *And the very God of Peace sanctifie you wholly; and I pray God that your whole Spirit and Soul and Body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.* To this you answer. SECT. 20.

[1. That these words suppose no Promise, much less any absolute Promise made by God to preserve their spirit, soul, and body blameless; but only contain a Prayer or holy Desire, conceived by the Apostle for such a gracious vouchsafement from God unto them.]

But doth not the Apostles *Prayer* suppose Gods *Promise*? What but Gods *Promise* made him so bold at the *Throne of Grace*? Do you use to *pray* for what God hath *not promised*? I pray, what warrant have you to solicite him in such cases? the Apostle (I dare say) durst not *ask* any thing of God more then what

God had *promiſed* to give. According to the tenor of Gods *Promiſes*, was that of his *Prayers*; *praying conditionally* for what God had *promiſed* but *conditionally*; and his *abſolute prayer* here, infers not only a *Promiſe*, but an *abſolute Promiſe* from God.

Well, but you add, [This his Prayer, rather proveth, that ſuch a preſervation might have been with-held, or denied by God unto them, then the contrary; for thoſe things are more likely to be ſought by Prayer, which may poſſibly not be granted or obtained otherwiſe; then thoſe which might with the greateſt confidence be expected upon another account, and without ſuch Prayer.]

It ſeems by this, you uſe to pray moſt for ſuch things as are [moſt likely to be with-held by God, and denied, rather then the contrary.] And if ſo, I ask, Whether you pray in *Faith*, or no? It ſeemes you have a *Faith* which hopes to be able to remove all Mountaines, and to change Gods mind, ſo as to obtain from him [that which was likely to be with-held and denied by him,] and which fears not to miſs of what God hath *promiſed*, though it never put it ſelf to the trouble of *asking* it. I am ſorry to ſee ſo much forgetfulneſs of the nature of this duty of Prayer in a man wont to be ſo much famed for his excellent gifts of Prayer. I wis, we are wont to *pray moſt* for what we have reaſon to think will be leaſt denied; as *Graces* of all kinds, which make eſpecially for Gods glory; leaſt for what [is likely to be with-held] as *temporal Bleſſings*, which God often *with-holds*, and *withdraws*, even for our own *comfort*; *Et negat quod volumus, ut donet quod malumus.* We look upon God as *granting* our Prayers, when he *denies* that part of them which craved *lower* things, and gives us *better* in ſtead of them. We take it, he is more gracious in hearkning to our Suits, ſo as to grant us content with a *poor* eſtate, then in affording us (which he eaſily could, did his Wiſdome ſee it good for us) all *plenty* and *abundance*. We look on his granting us *patience*, as better then his giving us *deliverance*, which he could with a word, and as ſurely would, did not his Wiſdome ſee it better, to make us the more *holy* by *ſuffering* evil, when as a *freedome* from it would leave us the more *careleſs*. We confeſs we are moſt importunate with God in our *Prayers* for what he *moſt aſſures* us by his *Promiſes*; nor do we expect any thing from him upon [any other account without ſuch Prayer.] We are afraid of every thing that *falls into our mouthes*, without *opening* them to ask it. Nothing (we are ſure) comes as a *Bleſſing* [upon any other account] then Gods *Promiſe*, which alwayes waits to be uſhered into performance by *our Prayers*. The Apoſtle indeed *asks here* that God would preſerve their whole Spirit, ſoul and body, upon the account of Gods *Promiſe*; but he doth not [*expect* it with any confidence] without, not only *his own*, but *their Prayers* alſo. God who hath *promiſed* to *preſerve* his people, hath *required* his people to *pray continually*, both for themſelves and one another.

You adde ſtill, [What efficacy or prevalency with God, can be aſcribed to ſuch a Prayer, which ſeeks ſuch things at his hand, to the exhibition whereof he ſtands abſolutely engaged by Promiſe, Purpoſe, or the like; and which ſhould have been given, whether ſuch Prayer had been made or no?]

What [efficacy with God?] Good Sir, our Prayers pretend not to an [efficacy with God] in any other ſenſe then *this*, that *his Bleſſings* are not beſtowed till *our Prayers* have *prepared our ſelves* to receive them *as from his hand*, with a reſolution to imploy them *to his honour*; the [efficacy] of Prayer, is in reſpect of *our ſelves*, *humbling* us in the ſenſe of our *wants*, and *ſins*, which have made us *unworthy* to have our *wants ſupplied* by God, and *lifting* us up in a comfortable *expectation* of ſeaſonable *ſupplies from him*, who is *able* to do what he *will*, and *will* do what ever his *Wiſdom ſees meet*, for all ſuch as have recourſe to him in the Name of Chriſt, deſiring to lay out all they either have or are, to the glory of their Heavenly Father. The [efficacy of Prayer,] is not ſuch as to [prevail with God] to come to *new reſolutions*, but to execute his *holy and gracious Purpoſes*, in the *time* which he had determined from all *Eternity*. When the Apoſtle ſpeaks of *Prayer prevailing with God*, he ſpeaks to the *capacity of men*, and is far from intending

tending to blemish the *Excellencies of God*, while he essayes to bear up the *infirmities of his children*. And thus know, *those Prayers* have most [efficacy with God] which ask what God both *purposed* and *promised* to bestow. How should *those prayers* possibly miscarry, which beg what God hath *decreed* to confer on us? So then, [Gods purpose] to preserve their whole Spirit, and Soul and Body, takes not off from the [efficacy of the Apostles Prayer,] and the Apostles *Prayer* intimates nothing to deny such a *purpose* in God; yea, Gods *purpose* and *promise* are the main grounds of the Apostles *prayer*.

But 2 you say, [The same thing which the Apostle here prayeth that God would do for the *Thessalonians*, he in other places exhorteth men themselves to do, which plainly sheweth, that the intent and purpose of the Apostles Prayer in this place, was not that he would by a prevalent and irresistible hand, preserve them blameless, which is his manner of acting in the performance of all his absolute Promises; but that he would afford unto them such gracious excitements and quicknings by his Spirit, whereby they might be effectually provoked and engaged to put forth themselves to do what was requisite on their parts, for, and towards such an actual preserving of themselves; which notwithstanding he clearly supposeth in the passages immediately subjoyned, that they very possibly might not do, even under such excitements and engagements.] SECT. 21.

I answer, The Apostles [exhortations in other places,] prove not that the intent of his *Prayer here*, was to crave less then [Gods *prevalent* and *irresistible* preserving of them,] Gods *own Exhortations* to us to do, may as well prove, that he doth not *intend* prevalently and irresistibly to *make us* to do, what he *exhorteth* us to do. But this is false: God exhorts us to do sundry things, which *we* cannot do of *our selves*, and which *he intends* to make us to do [prevalently and irresistibly.] *Make you* (saith he) *a new heart, and a new spirit*. Will you say, any man *can do this*? or that God doth not intend to do this to *any*? If *God intend* not to do it, what means his *promise, I will give them a new heart and a new spirit*? If the *men can do it* of *themselves*, either they can make themselves *new hearts* by their *old ones*, which is impossible; or by their *new ones*, which is as absurd; find me out a *third* way, and you shall be *nulli secundus*.

2. These [gracious excitements, quicknings, and enlargements of heart] which you say the Apostle prayes for, were they irresistibly wrought, or no? If *not irresistibly* wrought, then the Apostles prayer miscarryed; if *irresistible*, why might not he as well be conceived to pray that God would *irresistibly preserve* them, as *irresistibly quicken* them?

3. We deny not, but there was *somewhat* required on *their* [*parts* towards the *preserving of themselves*.] We say, That what was [required on their parts,] was wholly *effected* on *Gods part*; not so as to *do it*, but to *make them do it*; as to *believe, repent, watch, pray*: And what was [required on their part] *to be done*, was *requested* here by the Apostle of *God*, that he would *make them do it*.

4. We grant, that [the Apostle intimates, it was possible they might not do what was required;] yea more, that it was *impossible they should do it, as of themselves*; but he suggests no such thing, as that it *was possible* (Gods purpose considered) that he would *not make them do* that by the continual influence of his *Spirit*; which otherwise, not only the *flesh* which was in them would oppose, but even all the *Graces* inherent in them, without a continual *supply, could not effect*. What if [*Paul* charged *Timothy*, thus, *That thou keep the Commandments, without spot, unrebukable, until the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ*?] follows it, *ergo*, God might not keep his promise to keep *Timothy* to keep the Commandment? *Timothy*, it is true, would have been *too apt to break* the Commandment; God could not *break Covenant*. Again, *Timothy* might possibly sometimes *fail* to *keep this Commandment*: it follows not, *ergo*, he should *fail of Salvation*. God may permit his Servants to *break the Commandment*, that they may see it is he who alone helps them to *keep it*, and that they may *repent* of their *breaking*, and have

have *more recourse* to him for help to *keep it*. What if [*Peter* adviſe his Proſelytes *to be diligent, that they may be found of him in peace?*] it followes indeed, *ergo*, there was a *poſſibility* they might prove *not diligent*; but it doth not, that there was a *poſſibility* that *God might prove neglectful of his promiſe*, which is to keep them, and ſometimes to make their *former negligence*, to be a ſpur to their *future diligence*. And what if [*Peter* bid them *beware leſt they alſo, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from their own ſtedfaſtneſs?*] They may be led away too *far*, and are too *often*, and actually *fall* ſhrewdly from *their own ſtedfaſtneſs*; it followes not, That *Gods purpoſes* are the *leſs ſteady*; and that he will not aſſuredly *make them ſtand* the more *ſtedfaſtly* for ever after, for their *falling* now and then. What you add,

3. [That a ſuppoſition of a certainty, that God would actually and with ſucceſſe, preſerve them blameleſs, would clearly deſtroy the force of the Exhortation;] hath had ſufficient Anſwer already, if it knew when it were well.

SECT. 22. 4. That [thoſe words, *God is faithful*, do not imply more then this, That God would be careful and tender over them, as far as his intereſt lies, or is any wayes meet for him to interpoſe, act, or aſſiſt towards their preſervation, as you have ſhewed *Sect.* 17, 18, 19. and *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* 20.] is a puff. I refer the Reader to my Examination of thoſe Sections; where I have ſhewed, That it is neither *diſhonourable* to *God*, irreſiſtibly to defend his children from falling, nor prejudice to his *children*, to be irreſiſtibly preſerved to Salvation. When your Learning ſhall undertake to demonſtrate either of theſe to be falſe, I ſhall with all due reverence attend your Dictatorſhip. In the mean time, you being as it were [jealous] (as ſure there is juſt cauſe) [of ſome offence given by ſome ſuch Explications as theſe, as *far as his intereſt lieth*, as *far as is proper for him to do*, or *appertaineth to him*, with the like, when the doing or performing of ſuch things is attributed unto God, wherein men alſo are to joyn and act with him.] You add

1. [Some Fragments of *Auſtin* and *Chryſoſtome*] which have been ſerved in upon the Table long ago, *Chap.* 5. *Sect.* 26, 27. and are now too mouldy for us to have any ſtomack to them a ſecond time. Let him that is pleaſed, take along the muſtard and Sugar too, to be found *ut ſupra*; But I have more mind to walk abroad, to look upon your Team of horſes in your *Simile*, to ſee how well they will draw all out of the mire. Sure, never had any horſes ſuch encouragement to lay out all their ſtrength in drawing a Dung-Cart, as theſe that are honoured ſo highly, as to be made [repreſent the drawing of the Spirit of God,] and clearly to [illuſtrate that there is very good reaſon of ſuch attributions] as Mr. *Goodwin* is ſpeaking of, [Whether unto God or unto men, or any other efficient cauſe, *viz.* to be ſaid to effect, when they contribute any conſiderable degree of efficiency, towards the production of an effect, whether the Effect be actually produced or no?] I dare ſay we have here a piece that would puzzle *Banks* his Horſe, as great a Philoſopher as he was moſt worthily voiced to be. Well, let us ſuppoſe him in the Chair, as the moſt ſufficient Moderator to ſtate the Controverſie which we are now to take in hand. [Suppoſe four or five horſes yoaked in a Team:] you ſpeak Cockney Shire: horſes are wont to be *harneſſed*. We do not uſe to diſhonour their necks ſo far as to put a *yoak* on them; but conſidering how highly you dignifie the horſes in the preſent compariſon, we will ſuppoſe they will not be diſpleaſed with this unſutable word, but be as forward to ſerve you to the uttermoſt of their power in *drawing*, ſo as to make for a need the very Cart run before them. [Suppoſe then ſtill the four or five horſes in a Team, and that one or two of theſe ſhould pull or draw luſtily, yet becauſe the reſt are jadiſh and lazy, and will not put their ſhoulders to it: the Waine being heavy laden, ſticks faſt in the ſlough, and is not drawn out. In this caſe, becauſe the horſes ſuppoſed to pull ſtoutly, do as much for their parts as was requiſite for them to do toward the drawing of them out, and that which would actually have drawn it out, in caſe their fellowes had joyned as they ought, and might, in the ſame act of drawing with

with them, there is no reaſon why they ſhould loſe the credit or commendation of their activity, through the jadiſhneſs of their fellowes, nor conſequently why they ſhould not be ſaid to have drawn the Wain out of the mire. In like manner when God, &c.]

We had need of a new Court of Honour, whither to have recourſe for a ſage Judgement in the Caſe depending, ſo much concerning the ſaid credit and reputation of the ſaid Horſes. But ſurely the ordinary Waggoners are not perſons of ſuch quality, as to be meet Arbitrators in the preſent buſineſs, in point of *Honor*, of which they have no conſiderable reſentment: and it ſeems they do not over-wel underſtand that of *Equity*, who forgetting the [*credit*] and *dignity* of the horſes which draw ſo luſtily, do too barbarouſly load their more noble backs with as many unworthy *whippings* as thoſe of the [jadiſh and lazy horſes.] And whether it be for want of Mr. *Goodwins* Logick or ingenuity, or what elſe, I know not; but they will never be perſwaded to give thoſe well deſerving horſes ſo good language, as to ſay, [they have drawn the Wain out of the mire.] as long [as through the jadiſhneſs or lazineſs] of their ill matched fellowes [it ſticks faſt in the midſt of it.] Well, that is their want of Breeding or Civility. But Mr. *Goodwin* would teach them to ſpeak at a better rate, and according to the merit of theſe luſty horſes, to ſay. the [*luſty horſes* have drawn the Wain out of the mire] notwithſtanding the reſtie Wain [never moved;] nor is it [equitable that the luſty horſes ſhould loſe their due commendation, and not be ſaid to draw out the Wain, albeit the Wain be never drawn out] through the ſloth and negligence of the other Jades: It may be, through the unreaſonable bulk of its own load, which was chiefly acceſſory to the default.

[In like manner (ſaith he) when God contributes his efficiency towards the keeping of men blameleſs, and that ſuch an efficiency, which being ſeconded and complied with by them, according to their duties and abilities for the action, would actually produce the effect, and keep them blameleſs; indeed there is no reaſon, why he ſhould be deprived of the honour of his action, becauſe men are ſlothful, and will not act with him, and conſequently why he ſhould not be ſaid to keep them blameleſs, how blame worthy ſoever they be through their owne defaults.]

Without offence, I know not whether, in the protaſis of the horſes, you talked more like a *Scholer*; or in the *Antapodoſis* of God, like a *Groom*. Who, I beſeech you indeavors to [deprive God of the honour of his actions toward the keeping of men blameleſs, even when they are not kept blameleſs?] but is this to [deprive God of his honour,] not to deprive our ſelves of our *reaſon*? It is no diſhonour to God, to ſay, 1. The men are not kept blameleſs by God, notwithſtanding any action of his, as long as they continue blame-worthy. And 2. God doth not keep thoſe men blameleſs, whom he leaves to be blame-worthy, notwithſtanding all his actions upon them. And 3. God doth ſo keep his Saints blameleſs, as that he irreſiſtibly keeps them ſo. Why, but the reaſon which you give for your denomination, is ſuch as gives honour to God by *inches*, and takes it away by whole *ells*. [1. God doth *no more* towards thoſe who are *kept blameleſs*, then he either doth, or is ready to do towards thoſe who are *not kept blameleſs*. 2. When any of his Saints are actually *kept blameleſs*, the honor of it is moſt properly due unto him:] not moſt properly (by your leave) upon your ſuppoſition, that [he doth, or is ready to do as much for thoſe that are not kept blameleſs.] In this [uniformity,] as you ſpeak of *Gods actings*, it is clear, the *difference* of the *event* is wholly from *men themſelves*; which whether it ſound for the honour of God, let any ſober man judge: And when you ſay, [There is no reaſon why it ſhould not be aſcribed unto him in the former caſe, as well as in the latter,] you clearly imply, there is according to you, *no more reaſon why it ſhould be aſcribed unto him in the latter caſe, then in the former*. And where then is the ſingular honour that we owe to God for *keeping us blameleſs*, above the *proportion* wherein the *Damned are indebted to him*, though *not kept blameleſs*? I yeeld you, it is [a more honourable

honourable expreſſion to ſay, a man did ſuch or ſuch a worthy action, then to ſay he did ſomewhat towards it;] but it is not as *true* an expreſſion to ſay, a man *did a thing*, as *much as he did towards it*, if the thing *were not done*; and as *honourably* as you conceive you ſpeak of God, when you ſay [he did that which was not done,] you ſpeak more diſhonourably of him when you ſay, [he intended to do that which was not done.] As much as there is in that

[——*Careat ſucceſſibus opto,*
Quiſquis ab eventu facta notanda putat.

That mens Wiſdom and integrity are not to be meaſured by the ill ſucceſſes of things contrary to their intention;] there is nothing in it that reacheth God, whoſe intentions are alwayes anſwered by the effect; and though the greateſt *wiſdome of men* may miſcarry and fall beſides their intentions, through the over-ruling Providence of God, who gives not alwayes the *Battel to the Strong*, or the *Race to the Swift*; yet *Gods Wiſdome* and Power, are ſuch as cannot meet with ought that can give them a *check*, or divert them out of the *way*, and keep them from coming to the *end* they *intended*. That [God acts uniformly in his wayes of Grace,] as you phraſe it, is but *petitio principii* We ſay, he *varies* thoſe diſpenſations according to the *pleaſure of his will*; and though he be to be honoured in his Wiſdome, Juſtice, Soveraignty, Mercy, by all the ſons of men; yet more eſpecially are the *Saints to honor him for his ſpecial Grace.*

5. And laſtly, ſay you, [The words in hand cannot be judged promiſſory, or to ſuppoſe a Promiſe, becauſe then it will follow, That God ſhould ſtand ingaged by a Promiſe to preſerve Believers, not only from total and final Apoſtaſie, but from all partial and temporary declinings alſo; for they that are ſanctified wholly or throughout, and whoſe *whole Spirit, and ſoul, and body are preſerved blameleſs, &c.* are in the ſame ſenſe preſerved from all, and all manner of declinings.]

I anſwer, 1. That God hath promiſed to ſanctifie his Saints or all Believers *wholly*, and accordingly he will do, in reſpect of *degrees* in Heaven, and here on earth he doth it in reſpect of *parts*, as they uſe to ſpeak: *Spirit, Soul, Body*, are ſanctified *wholly*; that is, *every part* and *faculty* of them is *ſanctified*, though neither be ſanctified more then *in part.*

2. He hath promiſed to preſerve their *whole ſpirit, ſoul and body blameleſs unto the coming of Chriſt*, and accordingly doth it; yet doth it not follow, That they are preſerved from *all*, and all *manner* of *declining*: Every *declining* is not that which will take off from their *blameleſneſs among men*, much leſs in the *day of Chriſt*; their *blaming themſelves* renders them *there unblamable*; and *judging themſelves, they ſhall not be judged.*

SECT. 24. You have at

The laſt piece of Scripture [called upon,] as you are pleaſed to call it, [for ſupport of this ſecond Argument, *Being confident of this very thing, that he who hath begun a good work in you, will perform it unto the day of Jeſus Chriſt*, Phil. 1. 6 This Text (ſay you) is of the ſame interpretation with the former, onely it hath not ſo much of the letter or face, as ſome of them have, for an abſolute promiſe from God unto the Saints, that he wil cauſe them to perſevere.]

I muſt here a little wonder at your face and confidence, conſidering the Apoſtle profeſſeth his being *confident of this very thing that he will perform what he hath begun, will* no leſs then *confirm them unto the day of Chriſt*, as he had *converted them unto him.* Well, but ſay you,

[1. This confidence, or perſwaſion rather, πεποιθὼς,] (a word which (by your good leave) carries as much as may be) is not built upon a Promiſe of God, but upon a charitable and equitable apprehenſion he had of the ingenious integrity and ſimplicity of their hearts, towards Chriſt, his Saints, and Goſpel; which kind

kind of temper, or frame of ſpirit in men, is of all others, moſt promiſing of Perſeverance in well doing, through the Grace of God, and conſequently of the continuation of this grace unto men, in as much as, *Deus non deſerit, niſi deſerentem.*]

But could their [ingenuous temper of Spirit,] give him ground of ſuch confidence, without a *Promiſe from God*? How many men of [ingenuous temper,] have even *we* known to miſcarry? I yeild, *their faith* was *part of the ground* of *Pauls confidence* in *this caſe*; but as an *evidence of their election*, and no otherwiſe; without that, the moſt [ingenuous temper] could give no conſiderable matter of confidence. God, it is true, [*non deſerit niſi deſerentem.*] But I pray, what temper is ſo ingenuous, as did not deſert God from the beginning, neglect his Precepts, Promiſes, Threatnings, his Word and Works? And hereupon God withdrawes thoſe meanes from many of theſe ingenuous tempered men, but to none to whom he ever afforded them, but ſuch as neglected them; but he never ſuffered any of *his ſo to deſpiſe them*, as that he ſhould *thus deſert* them: for a *time* they may *deſert him*, and he accordingly *deſerts them*; in reſpect of the *comfortable influences*, not the *neceſſary ſupportings* of his Spirit: Where he *once gives that*, he *never repents*. Well, but that [this was all the ground of *Pauls* confidence,] appears, ſay you, [from the words following, *Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all; viz. that he who hath begun a good work in you, will perform it &c. becauſe I have you in my heart, in as much as both in my bonds, and in the defence and confirmation of the Goſpel, ye are all partakers of my Grace*; therefore it was the preſent goodneſs and honeſty of their hearts, was the ground of that perſwaſion.] Right; it was [a ground,] not *all the ground*; it was the *uppermoſt* and *firſt* in *ſight*; but the *election* of God (of which this was a *fruit*,) was the *deepeſt* and *ſureſt*. His *building his confidence upon their faith*, doth not oppoſe *his building his confidence on Gods Election*, whence their *faith* iſſued. He was led by their *Faith*, as the *ſtream*, up to their *Election*, as the *Fountain*. *That* was the *loweſt ſtone* in this *Building*, and which bare up the weight of *all the reſt*. But

[2. Had he had any abſolute promiſe from God, for the ground of that his perſwaſion, he would not have expreſſed himſelf with ſo much tenderneſs and warineſs, as to ſay, *Even as it is meet for me to think*; Gods promiſes would have taught him to ſpeak at another rate of confidence.]

I anſwer, 1. He had no *abſolute knowledg* of their *Faith*, and therefore *none* of their *Election*.

2. But as he had reaſon to be confident of their *Faith*, ſo proportionably of their *Election*; and this clauſe, *As it is meet for me to think*, hath I take it, this following, *of you all*: now he could at moſt, but *hope the beſt*, not *know the truth* of the faith of *all* that Congregation; and therefore I think this was not ſo *low*, but as *high* an *expreſſion of confidence* as could well be made, that it was *meet for him to think*; what? that *all* true Believers ſhould be confirmed in *General*? no not ſo only, but that *theſe Philippians* were *all true Believers*, and accordingly ſhould *all* be thus confirmed in *particular*.

Your [3. of the ſlipperineſs of this foundation; for his Exhortation] hath been anſwered already, and this being but a *cold diſh* of ſo *oft ſodden Colewort*, I leave your Reader that hath an appetite to feed heartily on it; but it is but *windy meat*, and will never breed other then crudities in his ſtomack.

SECT. 25.

What you alledg of *Calvin* and *Muſculus*, to prove that they interpret the place in hand, not concerning any *certainty* the Apoſtle had of the *perpetual continuance of the Grace of God with them*, but only of a *charitable or humane perſwaſion thereof*, relates only to the *particularity of all thoſe perſons*, that they were true Believers, of whoſe faith he could have no ſuch aſſurance, as is gotten by *infallible demonſtration*; not to this Truth in *General*, That *all true Believers ſhould univerſally enjoy ſuch a bleſſed continuance of the Spirit of Grace*.

SECT. 26. A third Argument you say [laid hold on for the service of the Doctrine of Perseverance, is founded upon the immutable Decree of Election, and operating after this manner: A Living or saving Faith, is given to none, but to those that are *Elect*; in which respect such a faith is called the *Faith of the Elect of God*; and God hath determined to bring his *Elect* to Salvation by Faith, with the greatest certainty that can be: from hence then it followes, either that the *Elect* must be brought to Salvation by Faith, with so much certainty, that they shall never fall away from it, either totally or finally, or that God is changeable in his counsel; but this latter is at no hand to be admitted, therefore the former must stand.]

How rudely have you rumbled up this Argument, and as it were, put it into a *Bots coat*, that you may expose it to contempt for weakness! whereas it is of that strength, that all the black Guard of Hell will never be able to confute it.

Sir, we propose it thus:

Whosoever is elected to Salvation, shall be preserved to Salvation: Whosoever hath Faith, is elected to Salvation: Ergo, *He shall be preserved*, &c.

The *Major* we prove thus; Gods Election cannot be defeated; *ergo*, whosoever is elected to Salvation, shall be preserved to Salvation. The *Consequence* is clear; the *Antecedent* is proved, Gods Power is infinite and irresistable, his Counsels immutable, and *ergo*, his Election cannot be defeated.

The *Minor* we prove thus: *Faith* is the *priviledge of the Elect*; *ergo*, Whosoever hath Faith, is Elected. The *Antecedent* we confirm by this Text, wherein it is called the *Faith of Gods Elect*.

Now let us attend whether you will not *answer* [at the same rate] that you pretended we *argued*.

[1. Say you, This Argument demands that which is Sactilegious to grant; *viz.* that God hath from eternity elected a certain number of men personally, and as it were by name considered unto Salvation.]

Why how now Doctor? What in such a huff, charging all the poor Ministers in the Church of Christ over with *Sacriledg*? The best is, you think *Sacriledge* is no *scandal*, and *robbing of God* is not punishable either at the *Common* or *Military* Law. But of what should you so Sacrilegiously rob God, if you should favourably grant our demand? Why, [the inconsistency of this notion, with the Nature and Attributes of God, hath been already intimated,] you should have repeated what you have elsewhere learnedly delivered, as for instance, [*If God elected any from Eternity, it must be himself; and if he reprobated any, it must be himself, for all things were God himself from eternity.*] And sundry other insoluble Objections your subtilty hath produced against this unmetaphysical Doctrine of Election, commonly swallowed by most Divines of all sides; and the [Sacriledg] never stuck in their *throats* or *stomacks*; nor had they any *upbraidings* of it, till that severe Censor Mr. *Goodwin*, in his reverend Chafe, threw it full in their *teeth*, and they must expect he one day will tell them their owne further, of the [inconstancy] of this crude [notion with the maine current of the Scriptures, Reason, and the Truth it self, in the second part of this Work;] what makes this [Truth it self,] after [Scriptures and Reason?] it seems you have ordinarily much more wit, then when you are in your anger. But who but Mr. *Goodwin* would have been allowed to talk at this insufferable rate of insolence and absurdity? Sir, the Elect are not so much [allied to *Paracelsus* his *Non-Adami*,] as you proceed to scoff, as you seem to be *Paracelsus* himself revived, and strutting in a Theological quetpo, and if you would set up the Trade, you would easily break all the Mountebanks in *Europe*; they are all fools to you in the Art, and so is *Theophrastus Bombastus* himself; you could for a need, read a Lecture to *Philip* (he may hear as good a one from you upon the place, as he did sometime from his black Doctor at the Gaol-grate. Can you wonder that all our little world dignifies you with the great title of *Goliah*, when you so rarely brave it against all the reverend

Maſters that are in *Iſrael*, and ſpeak as if your very breath were ſtrong enough to blow down all before you, without deigning to give one reaſon, with all your Vaunts, but turning us off, as you ſpake ſometimes, with [an old drug,] which belike is ſuch as the Apothecaries wife ſaid, was *hot in operation*, and *cold in working*. Well, but

[2. You ſay, That by the *faith of Gods Elect*, is not meant ſuch a faith as he gives unto men *elected* (as we pretend,) but the Doctrine of the Goſpel, which *Paul* was to preach to the Saints and the choſen ones of God.] I pray, what are theſe *choſen ones* but the *Elect*? You go on, [the carriage of the Text evinceth this, *Paul a Servant of God, and an Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, according to the faith of Gods Elect, and the acknowledging of the Truth which is after Godlineſs*. Meaning that he ſerved God, and performed the Office of an Apoſtle, according to the exigency of that Doctrine, which God had revealed to be preached unto his Saints, every where termed *his choſen ones*, as alſo *according to the acknowledging of the Truth which is*, &c. Meaning that he was alſo ſerviceable in preaching it unto ſuch as were yet Infidels, that they alſo might be brought to the acknowledgment of it.]

That the *faith* ſometimes ſignifies the [*Doctrine*,] I grant you; that κατ signifies [according to the exigence,] is yeilded too; that the Doctrine according to Godlineſs, ſignifies [the Goſpel,] is confeſt to boot. But why *faith* ſhould not in this place ſignifie the *habit whereby* we believe, *fides quâ*, rather then the *Doctrine which* we believe, *fides quæ*, you have not hitherto ſhewed us; and the *acknowledging* ſignifying an *act*, we may very well conceive that the *faith* here ſignifies at leaſt an *habit*. Why, but

[2. (Say you) If by Faith we ſhall underſtand either the grace of Faith given unto the Elect of God, or the act of Believing wrought in them, we ſhall make no good conſiſtency of ſenſe in the ſentence.] Why man? [For if *Paul* ſhould ſtile himſelf the Servant of God, and Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, according to the Grace of Faith or act of Believing in the Elect of God, what can we reaſonably imagine his meaning ſhould be? verily I underſtand not.] SECT. 27.

Truly I believe you: but you may pleaſe to conſider, that when *Paul* profeſſeth himſelf a *Servant of God, and an Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, according to the grace of faith, or act of Believing in the Elect*; he means *that* which is in *himſelf* as a *fruit of his Election*, and the *like whereunto* is in *all others* who have the happineſs to be *elected*. Why may not *Paul* ſay, he is a *ſervant of God* in this kind, according to *the grace and act of faith in the Elect*; as well as Mr. *Goodwin* might ſay, he is a ſervant of *God and man*, according the *faithfulneſs and courage* which is in the *Saints*, more eſpecially thoſe of his *own Congregation*?

You add, [Or if there could be any tolerable ſenſe made with ſuch a conſtruction of the word *Faith*; yet by the *Elect of God* we need not underſtand the generality of the Saints, but the *excellent ones*, (as *David* ſpeaks) among the Saints, whoſe faith is moſt ſignal and glorious.]

That the *Elect* ſometimes ſignifie the *beſt part* of the Saints, I deny not; but ſure that is, in regard of Election to *ſpecial offices*, *ſpecial meaſures of Grace*. The applying this word to theſe, hinders not but that *all the Saints* are *Elect*, and that the *Elect* is a word comprehenſive of *all the Saints*; as if we ſay *the men*, I hope this word *the men*, ſometimes eſpecially, ſignifies the *prime*, or *principally conſiderable men*; as Mr. *Goodwin* and his brethren are *the men* of the Nation: and yet withal, *the men*, is a word which includes ſuch poor ſorry fellowes as *my ſelf*, and thoſe my reverend Fathers and worthy Brethren, who have been pleaſed to expreſs themſelves to be of a different judgment from theſe *ſingular men*, Mr. *Goodwin* and his Brethren.

What you add, 4. is all *vapor*, and hath been ſcattered over and over, and it is enough to refer my Reader to what I have already ſaid againſt your new oppoſition againſt the old Doctrine of *Election from Eternity*.

Your [5. That God hath determined to bring his Elect to Salvation by faith only perſevered in,] is true: it is a ſcandal that you caſt on us, when you imply, we teach, as if *he would bring them to Salvation by faith, whether perſeverd in or no.* We ſay, he hath determined *to make them perſevere in faith*, that ſo perſevering they may be *brought to Salvation.*

SECT. 28. You fall about [a fourth Argument urged by us for the Doctrine of Perſeverance, taken from the Interceſſion of Chriſt.

Whatſoever Chriſt prayed for unto the Father, ſhall certainly be performed and done. But Chriſt prayed for the Perſeverance of all true Believers, as appears by his praying for Peter *in this kind.* Ergo.]

Here again you repreſent a *good* Argument in an *ill* dreſs; and ſo as that which is irrefragable for its *ſtrength*, may ſeem contemptible for its *weakneſs*. Do you think that men who have been acquainted with the eminent learning of thoſe Divines, whom you oppoſe in this Point, will be ſo gulled, as to be perſwaded they reaſon ſo *rawly* from a *particular* to an *univerſal*, without aſſigning ſome better reaſon then a bare ſaying, as your Maſterſhip is wont to do, [it appears ſo?] Sir, The *Major* in this Syllogiſm we owne, ſo do we the *Minor*; but we would bluſh to *confirm* it ſo ſorrily, as you pretend we do. And yet we ſay, there is enough in the *bottom* of *Chriſts Prayer for Peter*, to evince the Perſeverance of *all true Believers*; but there muſt be *many* a Syllogiſme uſed to *pump it out*. Well,

1. As to the Major, [you grant it is true, if rightly underſtood, that is with your Explication thus; *Whatſoever Chriſt prayed for unto the Father, ſhall certainly be done upon ſuch termes, as Chriſt in his Prayer intends, not ſimply or abſolutely, as the words may ſeem to import.*]

True; but we deny that he intended in his Prayer for the Perſeverance of Believers, leſs then an *abſolute* preſervation of them from *total* or *final* falling. See John 17.11. *Holy Father, keep through thine owne name thoſe whom thou haſt given me. I pray not that thou ſhouldſt take them out of the world, but that thou ſhouldſt keep them from the evil*, ver.15. *For all them that ſhall believe through their Word*, ver. 20, &c. *Father, I will that they alſo whom thou haſt given me, be with me where I am*, ver.24. And *I will pray the Father, and he ſhall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever*, John 14.16.

SECT. 29. And now, How prove you, as confidently as you aſſert it, [That Chriſt never prayed for the abſolute Perſeverance of Believers in their faith?] why? [It is no wayes likely he would have prayed for it, as he did, if God had abſolutely decreed the giving of it unto them, whether he had prayed for it or no?]

Who, I wis, ſayes ſo? We ſay, he decreed that *Chriſt ſhould pray for it*, and that they ſhould *receive* it, as it were upon the account of Chriſts *prayer*, that they ſhould owe it hereunto. Now that Gods *Decrees* do not make *prayers* uſeleſs, but are the *grounds* for prayer, hath been ſhewed already, and every Saint may bluſh to hear you deny it ſo valiantly and frequently.

[3. You come to conſider Chriſts prayer for *Peter*, which is (you ſay) the ſtrength of the Minor.] Good Sir, it is not the main foundation of the *Minor*, but it is a very good *butteres* to it; and by Chriſts prayer *for Peter*, we may well meaſure his prayer for *all Believers*. *Peter* ſhould have had, according to you, as little intereſt in Chriſt as any *other Believer*, it being foreſeen by Chriſt, he would fall into as great a ſin as *any Believer*; but notwithſtanding, Chriſt is pleaſed to pray for his *perſeverance abſolutely*, and therefore we may rationally conclude he did not pray for the perſeverance of other Believers only *conditionally*. And if you obſerve it beter, *Luke* 22.31,32. you will find that Chriſt had an eye unto *all* the Believers that were *then in the world* in this place, *Simon, Simon, Satan hath deſired to ſift you as wheat*: *You*, not *thee only*; as *wheat*, not a *ſingle grain*, which never was put into a *ſieve* to be *winnowed*; but *you*, i.e. *thee and all thy Brethren*: I have prayed for *thee, eminently*, not *excluſively for thee*, as who will be *moſt in-*

dangered

dangered, whereas thou doſt *leaſt ſuſpect* it; for *thee*, who wilt betray *moſt cowardiſe*, whereas thou pretendeſt to *greateſt valour and reſolution*: and *thee* will I make to be a ſingular pattern of the *ſtrength of my grace*, as thou wilt be an eſpecial example of the *frailty of humane nature*: when thon art *converted ſtrengthen thy brethren*; I pray for *thee* in reference to *them*, and therefore will not forget *them* while I pray for *thee*. But as to the caſe of *Peter*, you anſwer,

[1. That from hence it apparently followeth, that *Peters* faith was in danger of failing, and might have failed, had not Chriſt interceded for him; and therefore that God had not abſolutely decreed the Perſeverance or non failing of *Peters* faith, or any other mans.] SECT. 30.

Alas, we yield *Peters danger*, yet aſſert Gods *Decree* to preſerve him from it; and ſay, that he had decreed that *Chriſts prayer* ſhould be a *Means*, which he would uſe to preſerve him from it; and how know you that *Peters reflection* on *Chriſts prayer* was not a *great motive* to him to reduce him to Chriſt by *Repentance*? What elſe means the expreſſion of Chriſts *looking back on Peter*, but to *mind* him of what he *foretold* him, of *Peters denyal* of him, and his own *requeſt for Peter*? and what elſe that of *Peters going out* immediately upon it, and *weeping bitterly*? but that he reckoned with himſelf, How unworthily have I forgotten *him* and *my ſelf*, who ſo graciouſly remembred *me*! How *weak* was *my love to him*, to *deny him*, whoſe *love* was ſo *ſtrong to me*, as when he foreſaw I would *deny him*, imployed his intereſt in his Father that he would not *deſert me*; and though he knew I would be ſo *impotent in his behalf*, yet was ſo *importunate* and preva lent in mine? Thus did *Chriſts prayer* in a very rational way, work upon *Peters heart*, and occaſioned a holy recollection of his thoughts, of Chriſts *Power*, *Knowledge* and *Truth*, which he ſeemed to have laide aſide. So that we may conclude, *Peters Faith was preſerved not ſingly upon the account of Chriſts prayer without Gods Decree, nor Gods Decree without Chriſts prayer, nor either without Chriſts looking on him, the Spirits working on him*; all concurred in their ſeveral capacities to this happy work.

2. You ſay, [It cannot be proved that Chriſt prayed that *Peters* faith might never fail totally, but only, if ſo much, that it might not fail upon that particular temptation, which he knew would ſoon after come upon him.]

I ask, Whether there were any other temptation would come upon him afterwards which was now *unknown* to Chriſt? and if there were not (as I think you will be content to grant) then why ſhould we not conclude, that Chriſts Prayer reached to a deliverance of *Peter* from *that alſo*? Do you think Chriſt could not have prevailed with his Father to deliver him from *one*, as well as *another*? or that Chriſt knew not that it would little ſtead him to be delivered from *one*, if he were left to fall, ſo as to periſh by *another*? It ſeems you are not ſure Chriſt did ſo much as pray that *Peters* Faith might not fail upon that *particular occaſion*: [If ſo much;] what is that? that you are not ſatisfied that Chriſt did pray abſolutely that *Peters* faith might not fail upon that occaſion? or that Chriſt did pray that *Peters* faith might not *totally* fail upon that occaſion?

[It is evident (you add) from the Context, that this was all, if not more then all, that Chriſt prayed for, on the behalf of *Peters* faith, *And the Lord ſaid, Simon, Simon, Behold Satan hath deſired to have you, that he may ſift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, ſtrengthen thy brethren.*] I pray, did Satan deſire to ſift them only at that time? Would he leave ſifting upon the *firſt bout*, and ſit down as *weary*? This is not an intimation of a *particular ſeaſon* that Satan would take for this work; he will be at it as long as the world ſtands; he was buſie at *ſifting Peter* many a time after. Chriſts Prayer reacheth to *all his ſiftings*; that *Peters faith* might be preſerved, notwithſtanding. [Yea, but to infer from Chriſts prayer, that *Peters* faith might not fail, by, or under a particular temptation, that therefore it could, or ſhould never fail, is a ſtrain of no better Logick, then it would be to conclude, that

thoſe

those who were in the Ship with *Paul* never dyed, because God had made a Promise unto *Paul*, that he would give their lives unto him, as for that Voyage, *Act.*27.24.

Right: But I have shewed, That Christs prayer extended further then [*that particular temptation of Peters*:] you who will limit it thus, must shew your ground; for hitherto you have not done it But now see, as the giving those persons lives to *Paul*, inferred they should be brought safe to shore, not only notwithstanding *one* Tempest, but *all*; so doth Christs prayer that *Peters* faith might not fail, infer his safe landing in Heaven, in spight of *all* opposition, called here *winnowing*: Belike Christ prayed that *Peter* might be safe from *Satan*, but not from the *world*, which might beset him one day with no less temptation, then an *Oecumenical power* annext to his *Chair*; and with the Scepters of Princes, humbly prostrated at his Apostolick foot, or with the tempting preferment to a *Crown of Martyrdome*, wherein (belike) he might so pride himself, as to forfeit his *Crown in Heaven*. Christ prayed that he might be preserved from a temptation in the *High Priests Hall*, by a bold Virago, and some Ruffian Serving men; but not from the more dangerous temptation when he should sit as the *Great High Priest*, (forsooth) in his *Pontificalibus*, and be more tempted by the Superstitious adoration of his silly Votaries. Now we shall hear what you say.

[3. If it be by the vertue and efficacy of Christs prayer for *Peters* faith, that the faith of true Believers can never fail, then was their faith before this prayer obnoxious unto a failing: if so, then neither was there, nor is there any peremptory decree of God concerning the non-failing of the faith of true Believers; if so, then is there a possibility of the failing of it.]

1. This is more then we ever said, that [*Christs prayer for Peter had such efficacy on all true Believers*;] *viz.* as it was a *Prayer for Peter*. We say, it was a prayer for *Peter in order to all true Believers*, that their faith might be confirmed both by the *consideration of a failing in Peters* faith, and by the happy preservation of it from a *total failing*. In the *one*, they are taught their owne *Weakness* and *Corruption*; in the other, *Gods Power* and *Graciousness* to them.

2. The Prayer of Christ for *Peters* non-failing, doth not [suppose, that there was no decree of God for the non-failing of *Peters* faith,] *ut supra*; and so neither doth the Vertue of this Prayer on other Believers suppose it: the Decree of God was *that* whereon *this Prayer was founded*; and by the Decree of God was *this prayer ordained* to be made as a *way* wherein *it would come forth to Execution*.

SECT. 31. [4. You say, it is not so clear from the tenor of Christs Prayer, intimated by him, that he prayed against the total failing of *Peters* faith, under the said temptation, much less against the final failing of it afterwards; but most likely it is, that what he prayed for, was only this, that *Peters* yeilding to the temptation, or his being overcome by it, might not extinguish his faith upon any such termes, but that he might, and should eftsoons recover it by repentance.] What is the ground whereon you raise this Structure of [likelihood?] Why [That *Peters* faith did fail totally, seems probable at least, from these words of Christ, *when thou art converted, strengthen, &c.* men are not said to be converted, *à gradu ad gradum, sed à specie ad speciem*; not from a less degree of faith to a greater, but from unbelief to faith.]

I had thought there had been unbelief here in *Peter*, when he *denyes his Master*, and that that was enough to intitle him to a Conversion from *Unbelief to Belief*, not from *less belief to a greater*, but from that *great unbelief*, which lay above all his Belief at this time, to a great Belief; from being a *Denyer of Christ*, to be a *Denyer of himself* for Christ. What thinks your subtilty of that Prayer, we humbly conceive of the Saints, Psal, 80.3. *Turne us again, O God.* And ver.7. *Turn us again, O God, Cause thy face to shine, and we shall be saved.* Our English Meter

Meeter, which for your rare skill in Poetry, you cannot but esteem, hath it *Convert us, Lord, to thee, Convert our hearts to thee*; Have you no need of *turning* unto God, because you are a *Believer*? You have need, I am sure, of Repenting; μετάνοια, is (I think) a word that carries somewhat like *turning* in it.

Yea, but [2. Besides, that *Peter* was, until his Repentance, in the state and condition of those who shall be denyed of Christ at the last day (which could not be under any degree of true faith remaining in him;) (say you) is evident from that general and expres intermination of Christ, *Matth.* 10.33. *Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in Heaven.*]

Yea, but 1. If this be so, that [none shall be denyed by Christ, who have any degree of true faith remaining in them,] then it is as clear, may I say upon my grounds, that none of them who shall be so denyed, are in the same condition with *Peter before his repentance*; and consequently, *Peter before his Repentance* not in the same condition with them: this were *quid pro quo*. But

2. I add, That though *Peter* were supposed to be in such a condition, that had he *then dyed*, he should have been *denyed by Christ*, yet *Christ* was in a condition to *prevent Peters dying in that estate*; and so considering *his love to Peter*, witnessed by this *his Prayer*, he must be supposed to imploy *his Power* to keep *Peter* from *dying in that estate*.

5. What you close all with, that as *Peters* temptation, with an eye whereunto this Prayer of Christ was made for him, was particular, so was Christs Prayer for him, and nothing can be concluded from it for the preservation of other Believers, was fully answered, as well as alledged before, and so need not put us to any further trouble, see *Sect.* 28. Thus hitherto our Argument holds good, though Mr. *Goodwin* have done his worst. And I have done somewhat less in one particular of it, then else I should, because there hath been so much learned pains bestowed on that part by worthy Mr. *Jeans* in his Vindication of Dr. *Twisse*, though Mr. *Goodwin* vouchsafe not to thank him in as much as a libel, which Mr. *Jeans* his friends, it seems, did expect, as an ordinary favor from him.

SECT. 32.

2 Your next endeavor, is to undermine the Argument for the Perseverance of the Saints, drawn from the *Intercession of Christ at the right hand of God in their behalf*; *Who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that dyed, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh Intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?* So again, *Christ is entered into Heaven to appear in the presence of God for us*: and *since he ever liveth to make Intercession for us.* [From hence (say you) it is thus argued;

Rom. 8.35. Heb. 7.25.

If they for whom Christ intercedes at the right hand of God may fall away, so as to perish notwithstanding; then is Christs Intercession ineffectual and insufficient to preserve them: But Christs Intercession is not ineffectual, *&c. Ergo.* To this you answer,

[1. That it is no where affirmed that Christ intercedes for the Perseverance of the Saints in faith, or that they who do once believe, should never cease believing, how sinful and wicked, soever they shall prove afterwards.]

Nor did we ever say he doth intercede upon such termes. This is your old injury, for which we hope you will one day give us satisfaction: but we affirm, he *intercedes for the perseverance of the Saints in faith*, so as they may be kept from *such sin and wickedness*, as else would *keep them out of Heaven*, and make that as many *Mansions* as Christ hath *prepared* there, there would be no *Inhabitants*, but that they would all lye *void* and *desolate*. Christ intercedes for the *Spirit*, that he may *abide with his Saints for ever*; yea, he saith, *He will not say, that he will pray the Father*, for the *Father himself loveth them*, and will be ready to do all that can be desired without much sollicitation in their behalf, *John* 16.26.

The Exposition which you give of Christs Intercession, [That it is for his

Saints

Saints, as ſuch, and continuing ſuch,] is not right: it is [that they may continue ſuch,] elſe I yeild you it is, [That no accuſations from any hand whatſoever may be heard againſt them;] but [that no afflictions or ſufferings which they meet with in the world, may cauſe any alienation or abating of the love of God towards them, but that God will preſerve and protect them under them,] is a moſt ſtrange clauſe, for Chriſt to make uſe of in his *Interceſſion*. Why is the Saints affliction apt to [alienate Gods affection?] And is he apt to *love them the leſs*, becauſe *men hate* them? Is his *heart* in an inclination to be *turned from them*, becauſe his enemies *hands* are ſet *againſt* them? Belike he begins to be *aſhamed* to own them for *his Children*, when they are become *Priſoners* and *Captives*; and bluſheth to take ſo much notice of them as he was wont to do, when they are brought to the *Bar*, laden with falſe and ſcandalous *charges*; eſpecially he is apt to deſert their protection when they are put out of *mens protection* for defending *his Truth*: Are theſe [afflictions] ſuch things as Chriſt needs to intercede with his Father, [that they may not alienate or abate his affections?] What a ſtrange meaſure hath Mr. *Goodwin* of Chriſts *Interceſſion for us*, and his *Fathers love to us*? He thinks, belike, that Chriſt needs be earneſt with his Father not to be *aſhamed* of us, when we are expoſed *naked to the wide world*, nor to be *afraid to acknowledg us*, when we are *perſecuted* as with *fire* and *Sword*; nor to look *ſowrly* on us, when we walk *ſadly in many Tribulations*; nor to *cloud his face*, when we are lodged as in *darkneſs* and the *ſhadow of death*. He thinks, belike, God takes *our Poverty* and *Reproach* (as ſome fathers on earth may do) as a diſparagement to *his Honour*, and ſo is apt [to alienate or abate his love,] till we have made our ſelves more worthy of it, by repairing our fortunes. Is this the ſenſe you give of Chriſts *Interceſſion*? Sir, when the Apoſtle asks, *Shall Tribulation*, *Nakedneſs*, &c. *ſeparate us from the love of God*, his meaning, I had thought, had been, Shall Chriſt ſo little prevail with his Father, as not to keep up our hearts to him in the midſt of all preſſures, apt to caſt them down? Shall not he prevail with his Father to make our love to him moſt *fervent*, when our bodies are even *frozen* with cold? to make our *hearts* triumph in their joy in *him*, even when our heads are put under the heavieſt yoak of Tribulation? to make us *ſtand* valiantly for *his Truth*, even when we *run* away for fear of our *own lives*; yea, and to be ambitious to ſpend our lives in the *Defence of his Truth*, which is more precious in our eyes. Alack, That ſo high a wit as Mr. *Goodwins* ſhould flag ſo low, and be in this place ſo abominably dry, that I may not ſay, ſo ſtrangely ridiculous, where even the dulleſt Saint would be happily eloquent in ſetting out the ſenſe of theſe ſo ſweet words. My Maſters of *Coleman-ſtreet*, be pleaſed to examine this paſſage of your Doctors, and ſee whether the weakeſt of *you* could not have gloſſed this Text of the *Interceſſion of Chriſt* to a far better advantage, then this his Learned Reverence, who, ſome have ſaid, preacheth the Goſpel as *never man did ſince the Apoſtles*.

Well, let us go on with him however, and with an humble patience attend the remainder of his Worſhipful Lecture. [As for that demand, *Who ſhall ſeparate us from the love of Chriſt*? it is not meant of that love wherewith we love Chriſt, but from that love wherewith Chriſt loves us as we are his Saints, and abide in his love by keeping his Commandments.]

Wel ſaid ſtil; Theſe *Romanes*, belike, would have doubted whether Chriſt would not *forbear to love them*, (though *they did not forbear to love him*,) only becauſe being in a ſorry condition of cold, and hunger, and nakedneſs, they would not look altogether ſo amiably in his eye, as when they were full and flowing in all manner of abundance and glory. Sir, His meaning is, that howbeit *we be apt to conclude ſome abatement of Gods love to us*, becauſe he leaves *us at ſo low an ebb of outward comfort*, whereas he could, did he pleaſe, make it alwayes *full Sea*, and *high water with us*; and hereupon are too *ready to decline in our love to him*, and would (if left to our ſelves) cloſe in with the *world*, who (we would hope) would in time, make ſo much the more of us, as we are *more the worlds*; yet God continuing his love to us, and purely out of the tenderneſs of it, taking theſe *earthly things from*

us,

us, will work our hearts to continue, yea, and increaſe *in love to him*, and to *bleſs him*, for ſuffering men to *curſe us*; to *honour him* for permitting men to *reproach us*; to give up all *we have* and *are* to him, as a *ſmall teſtimony* of our humble thankfulneſs to him for his *incomprehenſible goodneſs*, in leaving *wicked* men to take *all from us*, as eſteeming we *gaine moſt*, when we *loſe all for him*; as knowing how eaſily *he can*, and how ſurely *he will* make us ſo full and honourable a compenſation, as for which we ſhall magnifie him to all eternity. This is the drift of the Apoſtle: What a thing hath Mr. *Goodwin* brought forth in ſo much *Pomp* and *State* in the room of it? *viz.* [That no afflictions or ſufferings which the Saints meet with in the world may alienate and abate the love of God to them.] I can hardly forbear from telling him here his own, and in his own language. What is Mr. *John Goodwin* to five hundred Diſciples of *John Calvin*; *Rumpantur & ilia*: But I had rather he ſhould duly correct himſelf, as I doubt not but he will, upon a ſecond conſideration of theſe rare notions.

You go on, [Neither is it to be ſo conceived, as if ſins, wickedneſs, looſeneſs, profaneneſs, &c. could not unſaint men, and hereby ſeparate them from the love wherewith Chriſt ſometimes loved them: (for that iniquity will ſeparate between them and their God, is evident from *Iſai.* 59. 2.) but the clear meaning is, that no Creature whatſoever, perſon or thing, can make Chriſt an enemy unto thoſe who ſhall in faith and love cleave faſt to him.]

Yes, it is to be conceived, *that no wickedneſs ſhall unſaint men*, not that they *ſhall* or *can* be at *once Saints* and *Wicked*, but that *they* who are *once* Saints, ſhall *never* be ſo *wicked* as to be *unſainted*. *Some Wickedneſs*, I had thought there had been in the *greateſt Saints*, and yet not [*unſaint them*;] but *ſuch wickedneſs* as is *predominant*, ſhall never be found in thoſe, whom God hath *once truly ſanctified*. That wickedneſs which is in the *beſt Saints*, may *ſeparate* ſo *between God and them*, as to occaſion a *hiding of his face* in reſpect of *his looking upon them* with his wonted *favour*, in regard of *his Adminiſtrations*; and *their looking upon him* with their wonted *comfort*; but no wickedneſs ſhall *ſo poſſeſs the Saints*, as to make an *utter ſeparation between them and their God*. And if you pleaſe to conſider it, this of *Iſaiah* is ſpoken to ſuch as had God for *their God*, in reſpect of an *outward profeſſion* on *their part*, and *outward Mercies on his*, beyond what he ſhewed to other *people*; but that he had ever *inwardly ſanctified them*, or they cordially *ſerved him*, whence appears it? In ſhort, to ſay [that Chriſt will not become an enemy to ſuch as cleave faſt to him in faith and love, as long as they do ſo, albeit they ſuffer hard meaſure in the world,] is queſtionleſs a Truth of ſuch *obſcurity*, that the Apoſtle had ſome cauſe to make ſo *ſolemn* a vindication of it. Who but great Mr. *Goodwin* can think this to be *tanti*? Great heads can make much of ſmal matters.

[2. Say you, Were it granted, that part of Chriſts Interceſſion for the Saints is, that their faith may never fail, yet the meaning hereof, would not neceſſarily, nor indeed with any competent probability be this, that no ſin or wickedneſs whatſoever that ſhall, or can be perpetrated by them, might cauſe them to make Shipwrack of their faith; but rather that God would graciouſly vouchſafe them ſuch means, and ſuch a preſence of his Spirit, whereby they may be richly enabled to keep themſelves in faith and a good conſcience unto the end.]

We ſay, That greater wickedneſs would make Shipwrack of their faith, as well as *You*; and that *Chriſt only intercedes that they may be preſerved from it*; but we tremble to ſay, that he intercedes for no more then [a gracious vouchſafement of means, or ſuch a preſence of the Spirit,] as which depended on their owne pleaſure, wherewith God wot, they would be poorly enabled, if this were all, to keep themſelves. The Spirit, I acknowledge, enables them to keep themſelves, *They keep themſelves, and that evil one toucheth them not*, 1 Joh. 5. but their *keeping themſelves* is the work of *Gods holy Spirit in them*, from whom they have *both the Will and Deed*.

Say what you will againſt a wild conceit of Chriſts interceding [that no wic- SECT. 33.

kedneſs whatſoever, if committed and indulged to, ſhould deſtroy the faith of the Saints,] we abhor it. Still we ſay but this, Chriſt intercedes that God would keep them from ſuch wickedneſſe, that he may keep their faith and ſouls from deſtruction.

But ſay you, [If this be all our meaning, then evident it is, we render Chriſts Interceſſion, all as ineffectual, as we pretend they do, who deny the neceſſity of the Saints Perſevering notwithſtanding his Interceſſion: for evident it is, the Saints have ſhamefully fallen into no leſs ſins then murder, inceſt, drunkenneſs, &c.] True; but not ſo as to *lye* under them as *overcome*; and this is that which Chriſt intercedes for, *That they may not fall into them to ſuch a miſerable degree.*

SECT. 34. Here 1. You demand [From what quarter of Scripture, the leaſt air of ſuch a conceit can be pretended to breath?]

I ſhall tell you, Chriſt prayes not, as he profeſſeth, that Believers *ſhould be taken out of the world*, but *that they ſhould be kept from the evil*, John 17. While they are in the world, they will never be kept from the evil, ſo as not to be *inſnared* into it; the beſt is, but not to be *inthralled* under it. It was the priviledg of Chriſt to be *without ſin*, being made in all other *things like unto us*, Heb. 4. He it was in whom alone the *Prince of the world had nothing*; he hath too great a part in the beſt of the Saints. Did Chriſt intercede for an abſolute ſinleſneſs in his Saints, while in this world, I yeild his Interceſſion were *ineffectual*; but were there an *abſolute ſinleſneſs* in them, his Interceſſion were *needleſs*: What uſe of an *Advocate* where we need no more *pleas*? What ſhould he plead for *more grace* for us, when once we had no *more corruption*? When Chriſt hath *ſubdued all our enemies* (*ſin* we look on as the *greateſt*) he will ſurrender his Office, 1 *Cor.* 15. So that it is clear, that Chriſt intercedes for no more to be conferred on us at *preſent*, then this, *That though ſin may dwell, it ſhould not raign in our mortal Bodies.* Why, but

[2. You tell us the purport, end, and intent of the Interceſſion of Chriſt for his Saints, is the ſame with thoſe of his death for them.] Right; and it is nothing elſe but an appearing for us, as it were in that *body*, wherein he bare *all our ſins on the tree*. [Now certain it is, that the adequate end or intent of Chriſts dying for the Saints, as to the matter of Sanctification, was not only to redeem or preſerve them from high miſdemeanors in ſinning, and ſuch as are incompatible with their ſalvation, but from all, and all manner of ſin whatſoever, *Who gave himſelf for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purifie to himſelf a peculiar people, zealous of good works*, Tit. 2. 14.]

I yeild Chriſts purpoſe in his death, as to the Sanctification of his people, was to redeem them from all, even the ſmalleſt *Peccadillo*, that they may be without the leaſt *ſpot* or *wrinkle*, or *any ſuch thing*; but it was not to redeem them thus fully, till they were brought *to heaven*. This Redemption as to *Sanctification*, is on earth but in *fieri*, and a tendency to ſuch abſolute perfection; it advanceth no further then a *hatred* and *abhorrency* of the *leaſt* ſin, and an endeavor of the *higheſt perfection*; and if you pleaſe to obſerve it, this word *purifie*, intimates, that the purpoſe of Chriſt, was to proceed no further on earth then to *purifying*, which ſuppoſeth ſome *leſſer Relicks of Impurity*. But what comes in *your head*, of all men living, to talk of [Chriſts purpoſe in his death as to the Sanctification of his people?] you can mean no more then a giving them a *fair example*, in his *own ſubmiſſion* to the will of his Father, and a *remembring* his people how ready they ſhould be in all *active obedience*, ſeeing he yeilded ſo much *paſsive* obedience; or perhaps an *intimating* of the great danger of ſin, the leaſt requiring ſo great and invaluable a ranſom, (and yet in truth you think Chriſts actual death was not neceſſary for any mans Salvation, though never ſo great a ſinner;) but ſay elſewhere, [That he purchaſed no ſanctifying Grace, other then ſuch as all the Kernes and Pagans in the world are as fairly inveſted with, as any of the firſt born of the moſt peculiar people, and moſt zealous

zealous for good works, *Chap.*17. We ſay, Chriſt purchaſed Grace for his people, to *Sanctifie them through the Truth*; but that he purchaſed not, nor purpoſed any ſuch thing, as that they ſhould have the *full meaſure* of Grace on *earth*; but that he intended to leave ſome mixtures of *infirmities* and *corruption*, whence he would take the greater occaſion for the manifeſting of his *Power*, and give them the greater occaſions for the magnifying of his *Mercies*, and that notwithſtanding theſe interſperſions of infirmity, and corruption, he will not fail to bring them where they ſhall on a *ſudden* be made all glorious, both *within* and *without*; and to this purpoſe he engageth all his Intereſt in Heaven, and Power on earth, interceding as a Prieſt there, and teaching as a Prophet, yea, and governing as a King here; and when once he hath finiſhed *this buſineſs*, he will *give* up his place (as it were) to *his Father*, that *God may be all in all*. He will (as it were) lay down his Scepter, when once he hath ſeated his *Saints in Heaven*, and vanquiſhed all their enemies above; till that be done, he omits nothing that is *neceſſary for their Salvation*; nor can they any of them be defeated of it, but that he muſt loſe his aime in his *ſuffering on the Croſs*, in his *Interceſſion at the right hand of his Father.*

You are now for the ſixth Argument, which you ſay we propoſe thus; SECT. 35.

[*Whatſoever true Believers ask or pray for unto the Father in Chriſts name, eſpecially being neceſſary unto Salvation, that they certainly, and alwayes obtain*, Joh. 16.23. 1 John 5.14. *But they daily pray for conſtancy and perſeverance in true Faith*; *as* viz. *that God would not lead them into temptation, but deliver them from evil.* Ergo, *Certainely they obtaine Perſeverance of him.*] To this yon anſwer,

[1. That this whole Argument might be granted without either prejudice to your Doctrine, or advantage to ours; for the queſtion is not, Whether the Perſeverance of the Saints be a thing poſſible, or whether it may be obtained by a diligent uſe of means; but whether there be not a poſſibility that the Saints may neglect the means?]

Yes; there is not only a *poſsibility* that they *may neglect them*, but an *impoſsibility* that they *ſhould not neglect them*, if left to themſelves. But ſay we, The Spirit of God is engaged to keep them, not indeed from *all neglect*, but from a *total* and *final* neglect of them. And therefore when you ſay,

2. [That the Minor Propoſition, *That true Believers daily pray for Perſeverance* is guilty of begging the queſtion.] I yeild you, if it be underſtood *ſtrictly*; but elſe they do in a *larger* ſenſe *daily pray for it*, and a great deal *more heartily* then for their *daily bread*; and for this we have ſufficient proof at hand, in that their *hearts* do alwayes look towards Heaven, and ſend up groans which are as well underſtood *there*, as any *copious Orations*. And when they do omit that Duty of more *Solemn Prayer*; yet do they give themſelves a *ſecret check*, and that check is no leſs an *effectual Prayer*, a *condemning of themſelves*, an *acknowledging* of their continual dependance on *God*, who knowes every tacite and ſilent motion of their *hearts*, and is more taken with it (as I may ſay) then with the moſt *elaborate Harangeres*. But

3. [You ſay, The Major Propoſition it ſelf, in thoſe termes wherein it is propounded, is no propoſition of Faith, for it is not ſufficient for the obtaining of what they ask, that they ſhould ſimply pray in the name of Chriſt, or in faith; *i.e.* with a confidence of receiving what they ask; but farther, that they ask or pray according to his will; ſo that the frequent praying of the Saints for Perſeverance though in the name of Chriſt, and in faith, is no competent proof that they ſhall certainly obtain it; *i.e.* how wickedly and abominably ſoever they ſhall live, until it be firſt proved, that it is according to the will of God, that they ſhould pray for it upon ſuch termes.]

But do you think that ever Saints prayed that they might [obtain Perſeverance upon ſuch termes as theſe, how wickedly and abominably ſoever they ſhould live?]

live?] This is first, to unsaint them: What? *Saints* and desire a dispensation to [live wickedly and abominably?] all *wickedness* is the *abomination of Saints*; all *other evils* they know how to bear with an *humble patience*; that of *sin*, fills them with a just *indignation*. They look upon it as the *bane* of all their *comfort* on earth, as well as a *bar* to all their *happiness* in Heaven; they find every *smal sin* a *vexation*; and can they desire God, and that so devoutly upon their knees, that they may enjoy the *pleasure* of *great ones*? Can they who finde their hearts ever and anon aking with the smallest grudgings of their *old corruptions*, so ceremoniously solicit God for a licence to give up themselves to *new ones*? Can they who repose the whole joy of their lives in *mortifying their Lusts*, be presumed to imploy their *Power*, which God is pleased to let them have with his Majesty, for a warrant to *nourish them*? Name me but one Saint that ever presented such a Petition, and became a Sutor at the *Throne of Grace* in the behalf of the *stool of Wickedness*. What, I pray, is the maine of the Saints Prayers, but that God would subdue their unruly Lusts and imaginations, which themselves are only able to *desie*, not to defeat? What, but that he would humble those proud thoughts, which insolently exalt themselves in spight of all Arguments they can use to abase them? that he would root out the close remainders of those cursed *Canaanites*, which sculke in their bosomes, and are more difficultly *discovered* then *conquered*? Did you ever hear Saint pray, that *God* would favor him in a *sin*, wherein (good man,) he even *loathes himself*? Which of the Tribe of Saints ever craved a *protection* for any of those disaffected inhabitants in his body, his most plausible corruptions? *Search and try me, and see if there be any Wickedness in me*, which I do not see my self; I am at open hostility against what ever sin I *know* in me, and will never willingly allow it a quarter. I have an implicite hatred against *all* its *abettors*, and long for nothing so much as an opportunity to be *revenged* on them, and make them fly the Countrey. All those *pleasures* which I am most *fond* on, I begin to *dislike*, as soon as I but suspect they hold *intelligence* with that enemy *sin*; and now the thought of them is as *bitter*, as before the taste of them was *sweet*. I cannot endure that *money* in my purse, which hath *come in thither* through the *hand* of *sin*, or which I am jealous may be *flocked thence* to be imployed in its *service*. I had rather be at my *dinner of herbs*, with the quiet of my conscience, and the favor of my God, then keep a *house* all the year long answerable to that of *Ahashuerus*, where sin shall either *furnish* or *wait* on the Table. I am ashamed of that honour which hath either sin for its Usher, or the Holder up of its Train. I know no *Honour* that entrencheth upon *Gods glory*, but what will either *invade* or *undermine* mine own *Reputation*: the *breath* of all such applause *stinks* in my nostrils. Give me (Lord) favor with *thee*, and I am in a condition to overlook, in an holy superciliousness, all the unworthy *fawnings* of any of thy Creatures. These are the thoughts and desires of the Saints when they come to pray; they ask God (Man) to *keep them from temptations*, they do not ask him that he would please to *allow them in transgressions*: They ask that he would fit them for *Heaven* here on *earth*, they do not that he would let them have leave to hold confederacy, and make the best bargains with *hell* without peril. I admire how any Saint can so abuse his brother, as to father such a Prayer on him, as [that he may be preserved to Salvation, how wickedly or abominably soever he shall live.] This is that for which they *belabour themselves* at the holy footstool of their Heavenly Father, that they may live without *sin*, albeit they dye not without *shame*; that they may live without *sin*, albeit they have nothing but *Godliness* (which their *content* knowes to make *Gain*) left them to live on. That they may be enabled to *serve* God, is the sum of their *desires*; they leave it to him to *reward* them at his *own pleasure*. Thus you do *unsaint the Saints* by putting this on them.

2. You do *beset them*. What? that they should account it a happiness to be as *Angels in Heaven*, and pray the while, belike, for their greater *comfort*, that they may have leave to demean themselves as either *Beasts* or *Divels* on *earth*? Their *Prayer* is according to our *Doctrine*, that *God would not lead them into temptation*, but

but *deliver them from evil*, and deliver them up to any *evil of ſuffering*, which he in his wiſdom ſees needful for defending them from the *evil of ſin*. But

4. [And laſtly (ſay you) if both the Propoſitions were granted, yet would the Concluſion follow upon no other termes then perfection in this life, as is proved by the Argument of the Perfectioniſts. *Whatſoever true Believers pray for according to the will of God, that they ſhall certainly obtaine according to his Promiſe*, John 16 23. 1 John 5.14. *But the Saints according to the will of God, and in order to his glory, pray that his will may be done on earth as it is in Heaven*; i.e. *perfectly; for ſo it is done in Heaven*; Ergo. Let the *Perſeveriſts* anſwer the Argument of the *Perfectioniſts*, and they will be able to anſwer their own.]

Sir, The *Perſeveriſts* are eaſily able to anſwer the Argument of the *Perfectioniſts*; yet will not even your admirable acumen, be ſufficient to ſhape a paſſable anſwer to *theirs*. We ſay, that the Saints pray, that the will of God may be done on earth as it is in heaven in reſpect of *ſincerity*, not *perfection*; of perfection which the *Goſpel accepts*, not of ſuch perfection as the *Law requires*; This *as* ſignifies but a *ſimilitude*, not an *equality*; as when Chriſt bids us be *perfect as our heavenly Father is perfect*; his *perfection* is an *unimitable pattern*, the *beſt* of ours is but a *ſorry Copy* of it. Now look what the Saints deſire in this kind, that they fail not to attain, ſuch a perfection as God in his Mercy approves, albeit they themſelves are apt to acknowledg in all humility, that he may in Juſtice condemn it; but that he hath a *Juſtice* too, in *making good his Covenant with his Son*, whereby he hath tied himſelf to *fulfil all his Promiſes*, as ſhort as we all fall of *fulfilling any of his Precepts*.

You blow up a ſeventh Argument for the Doctrine of Perſeverance, and it is this: SECT. 36.

They who ſhall certainly and faithfully be preſerved and kept by Chriſt unto the end, ſhall never either totally or finally miſcarry or fall away: But all true Believers are, and ſhall be thus kept by Chriſt: Ergo. The Minor is proved by theſe Texts of Scripture, *John* 6.37.39. and 10.27,28. and 17.12. and 13.1. 1 *Cor.* 1.8. *Epheſ.* 5. 23. *Jude ver.* 1. 2 *Timoth.* 1.12. *Hebr.* 12.2. 1 *Pet.* 1.5. You anſwer,

1. Very *ſullenly*, [that you have anſwered it already.]

2. Very *graciouſly*, [That the Concluſion, *That all true Believers ſhall never fall away*, if rightly underſtood, oppoſeth not our ſenſe in the preſent Controverſie; for you hold, that no true Believer ſhall miſcarry; but that all that fall away are no true Believers, but wicked Apoſtates at the time of their falling away or miſcarrying.]

1. I muſt needs ſay, you make the Concluſion ſpeak as little to your diſadvantage, and our advantage as may be [*all true Believers ſhall never fall away*,] it ſhould have ſaid, *No true Believers ſhall fall away*: for *all* true Believers never fall away, let as *many* fall away as you will, as long as *one* ſtands: But that is leſs; we will have that *no one* falls away, or ſhall *ever fall away*.

2, You ſcarce ſeem to be in earneſt, when you tell us, [you hold that no true Believers ſhall fall away, for that all that fall away are not true Believers, but wicked Apoſtates, at the time of their falling away.] You may as well ſay, *few men alive* ſhall ever be buried, for few men ſhall ever be buried while they are alive; but moſt that are alive are like to be buried; or that no Batchelors ſhall ever be married, for no men are Batchelors at the time they are married, or that no man that is in your Church ſhall ever go out, for when he goes out he is not in. This Anſwer you have reaſon to think [ſatisfies not the Argumentators] at any conſiderable rate. But yet, I pray, let me aſk, Whether men fall away becauſe they are Apoſtates, or are Apoſtates becauſe they fall away? This is a queſtion of much Conſanguinity to your preſent Anſwer, and though we are not ſatisfied with your Anſwer, we humbly deſire you to vouchſafe to ſatisfie this Queſtion, which if you ſhal deign to do, we may chance to think upon giving all due reſpect to your worthy Anſwer.

3. You

3. You ſay, [If theſe words, *Shall certainly and faithfully be preſerved and kept by Chriſt unto the end*, import no other preſervation or keeping by him, but what is meant in, and can be proved by theſe Texts, the Major is denyed. They who are kept by Chriſt in the ſenſe of thoſe Scriptures, may poſſibly fall away both totally and finally from their faith, in caſe themſelves ſhall not comport with Chriſt in his act of preſerving or keeping them, with their diligence or care to preſerve themſelves.] Then it ſeems theſe Scriptures intend no more then *ſuch a keeping by Chriſt* as leaves them at liberty to *run away from him* when they will: we think they import a keeping, *ſo as they ſhall never will to run from him*, albeit the *affections* of the carnal part, ſtill remaining in them, be too prone to ſuch a revolt. Let us try all the places in their turn.

[The firſt place, *John* 6.37. affirmeth, that Chriſt will in no wiſe caſt out him that cometh unto him, or that is (*A*) coming unto him, τὸν ἐρχόμενον But this proveth not; but that he that is on (*B*) his way toward Chriſt, may go back, before he comes fully to him; nor that he that is fully come to him may not depart from him. It only proveth that there is not the (*C*) leaſt diſpoſition or inclination in Chriſt to diſcourage any man whatſoever from coming unto him, nor to deny entertainment or acceptance to whoſoever ſhall come to him, and whiles he ſhall be willing to ſtay or abide with him; and elſewhere he (*D*) perſwades and exhorts thoſe that are come to him, to abide in him, or with him, as *Joh.* 15.4. and threatens thoſe who ſhall not abide with him, *Joh.* 15 4.6. *Heb.* 10.38. both which evidently ſuppoſe a poſſibility of their departure from him, who at preſent are with him.] I anſwer,

A 1. That I am content, you ſhall render the word ἐρχόμενον, *coming*; but how a man ſhould be *caſt out* that is not yet *come in*, is, I think, more then you will demonſtrate till *Chriſts coming*. But ſay I, 2 Whoſoever is *coming to Chriſt* is *come into him*, only not ſo *far*, but that he may come in *farther*, and adhere *cloſer* to him by a *new acceſſion* of *more degrees* of faith. And thus we are *ſtill coming* to Chriſt, as endeavouring to draw *nearer*, and cleave *faſter* to him every day then other. But now 3. If Chriſt will not caſt out any that is *coming*, then ſure *no man* that hath the leaſt degree of *true faith*, but *every ſuch* man ſhall for *ever be kept* and embraced *by him* and ſo is out of all the danger you ſpeak of, of a *total and final Apoſtaſie*.

B And this proves that he that [is on his way towards Chriſt,] by a *lively*, though *weak* faith, ſhall not *go back* from him. For what I pray is meant by *I will in no wiſe caſt out?* is it not a μείωσις? I will embrace, and by all means preſerve him? whoſoever once *cometh to Chriſt*, is *given him by his Father*: now *Of all that is given him by his Father, he will loſe none, but will raiſe it up at the laſt day*, ver.39. And *this is the will of his Father, that every one which ſeeth the Son and believeth on him, have everlaſting life*. It is not only *may*, as you may perhaps quibble upon the word in our Engliſh Tranſlation, but ἵνα ἔχῃ, that he *have*, and ſo accordingly ſaith Chriſt, and *I will raiſe him up at the laſt day*; how, but to eternal glory? Elſe he will *raiſe up thoſe that do not believe*, as well as *thoſe that do*. Again, if [the words imply a poſſibility of the going back of men *coming* unto Chriſt,] they may as well a poſſibility of their *non coming*, for their wills (I trow) are at as much liberty not to come on, as to go back after; but they are not at a poſſibility of this *not coming*; *All that the Father gives, ſhall come unto me*, ver.37. and ſo at no more of *going back*. Gods Power is alike able to *keep* them *from going back*, as to *draw* them ſo as to *come*, and he hath been pleaſed to expreſs his will to do *both*. We grant a [*poſſibility*] for them both *not to come*, and to *go back* after they are *come*; yea, an impoſſibility either to *come* or *ſtay*, if they were left to *themſelves*. But this notwithſtanding, *Gods will* overſwayes *theirs*, and in this reſpect it is *impoſſible* that either they ſhould *not come*, or that *coming they ſhould not ſtay*.

C So then theſe words prove more then [that there is not the leaſt inclination or diſpoſition in Chriſt to diſcourage any man whatſoever from coming to him,

or

or to deny entertainment;] what need you ſo ſolemnly aſſert that, when his errand was to call ſinners, and the greater ſinners men are, the more glory comes to him by their leaving their ſins, to come in to him? But whereas you ſuſpend his non inclination to entertain them [upon their willingneſs to ſtay,] you might have ſeen, it was *his Fathers love to them* to *draw them to come*, when they were by nature bent to ſet *againſt him*. Chriſts and his Fathers *love to Believers*, according to the tenor of your Doctrine, depends on the *Believers love to Chriſt*. We ſay, that all that are Believers did *hate the Father and the Son*, ere *they* were pleaſed to *change their hearts* by the gracious operation of their bleſſed Spirit; and that all the praiſe both of *coming* and *ſtaying* ſhould all *come clear home* to his holy influence.

D And what if [elſewhere Chriſt perſwade and exhort thoſe that are come to him to abide in him, or with him; and threatens thoſe who ſhall not abide in him?] This proves no more, then that there is in all of our *natures*, a wretched inclination to depart from him; it doth not prove that this inclination of our *nature* is not mercifully over-ruled by Gods *Grace*: his graciouſneſs uſeth theſe Exhortations and Threatnings as *means* to over-rule and *keep us the better in faith*, by ſhewing us how *ill* we can *keep our ſelves*.

Say you, [Whereas *ver.*39. he expreſſeth himſelf thus, *And this is the Fathers will that hath ſent me, that of all which he hath given me, I ſhould loſe nothing, but ſhould raiſe it up again at the laſt day*. It is evident, that he ſpeaketh not of loſing Believers by *defection from faith*, but by *death*. And to aſſure all Believers of *this*, he declares that it is his Fathers will and pleaſure, that he ſhould raiſe them all up (all that ſhould dye Believers,) unto a bleſſed eſtate and condition of life at the laſt day.]

It is true, That he means, *All that ſhall dye Believers*; but when he ſaith, *It is his Fathers will, that he ſhould loſe nothing of all that he hath given him*. I hope he means, that he muſt keep them all *from dying unbelievers*: and was Chriſt, I pray, able to keep them from *dying unbelievers*, or no? If not, he could not help it but that ſome would be loſt, when he had done all he could to prevent it; and then was the Fathers *command* ſomewhat too *peremptory*: if he *could*, then if he did not keep all from *dying unbelievers*, his *obedience* to his Fathers will, was too *perfunctory*. And whereas you add, [That their dying in unbelief, notwithſtanding, Chriſt fulfils his Fathers will to the utmoſt for their preſervation,] I demand, Whether he do not ſomewhat *more* for *thoſe* who are actually preſerved, then for thoſe who are not? If he do *no more*, then thoſe who *are actually preſerved* owe no more to him then thoſe that *periſh*; and may be allowed to give the thanks of their preſervation eſpecially to themſelves: if he did, then did he not do his uttermoſt for the preſervation of *them that periſh*. While you would caſt the *periſhing* of ſuch as periſh, on themſelvs; you do it ſo unhandſomely, that you reflect the praiſe of the *preſervation* of ſuch as are preſerved, to *themſelves* alſo. We ſay, Chriſt did *all for thoſe who are preſerved*, that he did more then was deſerved for thoſe who *periſh*. We attribute the *periſhing* of ſuch as periſh to *themſelves*, and their *own corruptions*, ſo as we attribute the *preſervation* of ſuch as are preſerved *wholly* to Chriſt and his Spirit. Laſtly, Whereas you pretend, [This is ſpoken only of his not loſing Believers, dying ſuch, by death,] it is evident that he ſpeaks of keeping them from *unbelief*: *I will not caſt out*; that is, I will *hold them in to everlaſting life*. *This is the will of the Father, that every one that ſeeth the Son and believeth on him*; he doth not ſay, [dieth in Belief] may *have everlaſting life*, and *I will raiſe him up*, &c. but that *every one* who is *once a Believer*, ſhould *ever be kept a Believer*, yea, to his *death*, and ſo be brought to *everlaſting life*, ver. 40.

For *John* 10. 27, 28. [you refer your Reader to *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* 37.] let him be pleaſed to take my Anſwer with it, and he will ſee your Expoſition is not ſuch as is beyond all poſſibility of Exception, as large as you boaſt you have there been in the proving it.

The

John 17 12. The next place *Joh.*17.12.preſenteth us with theſe words from Chriſt in his Prayer to the Father,*Thoſe that thou gaveſt me I have kept,and none of them is loſt.* But [neither can it be inferred hence, either that (*A*)Chriſt ſo keepeth all true Believers, that none of them at any time periſheth, or is loſt; much (*B*) leſs that he ſo keepeth them, that there is no poſſibility that any of them ſhould ever be loſt; no (*C*) nor yet that he had kept his Apoſtles themſelves.] (of whom (by your leave) it is a plain caſe that he ſpeaks particularly in the place) [ſo or upon any ſuch termes of keeping, that there was no poſſibility that any of them ſhould ever be loſt or periſh; but (*D*) only that he had ſo kept them, that none of them was loſt, excepting only the Son of Perdition (as it immediately followes) who was not loſt neither for want of good and ſufficient keeping (wherein doubtleſs, he did partake with his fellowes) but through the great malignity or wretchednes of his own will, his good keeping notwithſtanding. So that neither can hence any thing be gathered to prove any ſuch preſervation of the Saints by Chriſt, but that they may nevertheleſs decline both totally and finally.]

I anſwer, 1. That theſe (*A*)words, *Thoſe whom thou haſt given me, I have kept, and none of them is loſt*, virtually reach *all true Believers*: for ſure Chriſt keepeth them as effectually,he being *now in Heaven*, as he did any, while he was on *earth*. Shew if you can, that Chriſt is now either leſs *able* or leſs *careful* to keep them, then he was.

2. That theſe words, as ſtrongly prove, that he keeps them ſo, that there is no poſſibility they ſhould be loſt; a poſsibility of their being loſt, we grant,in reſpect of their *own aptneſs to ſtray and wander*; but this hinders not, but that there is an *impoſſibility* that they ſhould be loſt, in reſpect of Chriſts tender *care* of them.

3. And this was the caſe of the Apoſtles, who (I trow) could not have been loſt, but that Chriſt muſt have betrayed his truſt. As for the *Son of Perdition, he was loſt,that the Scripture might be fulfilled.* I deny that he was ever given to Chriſt,as the *reſt* of the Apoſtles. As an *Apoſtle*, he *was*, perhaps; as a *Believer*, he *was not*. Thoſe words, *But the ſon of Perdition*, are not *exceptive*, but *diſcretive*; he was not loſt [for lack of good and ſufficient keeping] by *outward meanes*; as for *inward Graces*, we deny, [he did partake (as you ſpeak) with his fellowes] but was left to the malignity and wretchedneſs of his *own will: He* was no part of Chriſts charge, and ſo Chriſt was not concerned to keep *him*. For the reſt,you ſay, [that they might have been loſt as *Judas* was loſt, Chriſts keeping notwithſtanding, and he partaking alike with them in that good and ſufficient keeping.] It appears then, that keeping was not ſufficient for any of them, unleſs they pleaſed to have been ſo good as to *keep themſelves*; and ſo they owe the thanks for their keeping to *themſelves* more then their *keeper*: he kept them *ſo* as they might be loſt at any time; it was not in his power to do more, then give good counſels and cautions, uſe encouragements, and threatnings, and ſome ſuch Diſcipline: but when all was done, though he were able with his rod and crook to ſcare away the *Wolf*, and keep him at a bay, yet could he not keep in theſe unruly *Sheep*, but that they could get out [notwithſtanding all his keeping] and voluntarily give up themſelves for a prey to the *Wolf*. Shortly, you deny *Chriſts power* over the hearts of Believers, to keep them by his *Spirit* from the Luſts of the *fleſh*, and give the hearts of Believers *power* enough to *deſtroy themſelves*, notwithſtanding *Chriſts keeping*; and indifferently well to *keep themſelves* without more then an *ordinary keeping* on Chriſts part. But I pray conſider, whether Chriſt had any great cauſe to *tell* his Father ſo ſolemnly of his keeping them, if hee had done no more? or to *pray* the Father ſo earneſtly, to *keep them through his owne name*, ver.11. if they were qualified to keep themſelves ſo well?

SECT. 38. You tell us of [the inſufficiency of the two next places, *John* 13.1. and
John 13.1. 1 *Corinth.* 1.8. to confirme the Doctrine of Perſeverance,and how you have found
1 Cor.1.8. them

them ſtrangers to the cauſe, the former in *Chap.*10. *Sect.*38. the latter in the ſame Chapter, *Sect.*20. *&* 16.] It ſufficeth me to refer the Reader to my Anſwer to your Diſcourſes in thoſe places.

You come next to *Epheſ.*5.23. [Where Chriſt according to the more general ſenſe of Interpreters, (for ſome underſtand it not of Chriſt, but of the husband) is termed the *Saviour of his Body*. Neither doth this Expreſsion (ſay you) import any ſuch preſervation of the Body or Church of Chriſt by him, which ſuppoſeth an impoſſibility of the defection of any one member from it. For 1. The Husband is the Conſervator of the wife, yet may the wife poſſibly miſcarry, yea, though the Husband acts his part upon the beſt termes.] And ſo the Church, belike, may periſh, notwithſtanding all Chriſts care and tenderneſs in keeping. For ſo it muſt, if there be, as you ſay, a poſſibility for any member to miſcarry; if for *any*, then *all*, one after another, and then what becomes of the *Church*? and what of the Promiſes Chriſt hath made it? He may (it ſeemes) be left without a *Spouſe*, and ſhe may *divorce her ſelf*, though he give her *no Bill*. Sir, It is true, that [the Husband deals only in a way of Perſwaſion, and may not keep his wife under your lock and key,] but it is the Churches happineſs, that Chriſt in his holy jealouſie, is pleaſed to uſe even *ſuch means to ſecure her*; the *key of David*, which *ſhuts and no man opens*. Thus the Saints are *hid in Chriſt*, and ſweetly preſerved by a kind of tender *reſtraint* upon their wills.

But 2. Being (it ſeems) unſatisfied with this, you add that [Chriſt is here ſaid to be the *Saviour of his body*, in reſpect of that protection which he affords unto it, and to every member of it, as ſuch, and whiles it continues ſuch.]

Yes, it is more to *keep it ſuch*. Or elſe how ſoon would it *rot* and *fall* off? We acknowledge what you ſay of [deliverance from death, hell, and all manner of penal evils, which he purchaſed with his bloud.] But ſay we, he purchaſed alſo *deliverance from corruptions*, infirmities, temptations, and all *ſinful evils*; he died to *purifie to himſelf a peculiar people zealous of good works*, to purchaſe *Sanctification for them by the Truth, and redemption from their vaine converſation*. We do not ſay, that [every preſent member, though it corrupts or falls off, ſhall have the ſame priviledges with the ſound.] That we ſay, is, That every *preſent member* ſhall be kept from *ſuch a degree* of corruption, as to *fall off*, though it may and doth often fall into *ſuch a degree* of corruption, as deprives it of many comforts, ſubjects it to many corroſives, and that the *cure* as well as the *corruption* puts it to pain. We grant, [it is no diſparagement to Chriſt to have members of his body, which are capable of Spiritual corruption to ſuch a degree;] it were, if he had not *skill enough* to *reſtore* thoſe corrupting members; and as he is head of members liable to *corporal* putrefaction; yet that putrefaction notwithſtanding, he reſtores them at laſt to life, and integrity of parts, and greater glory then they had before; ſo albeit he leave his members to ſome degrees of *Spiritual* corruption; yet doth he reſtore them to a *greater meaſure of Spiritual health and ſtrength*, and that with a bleſſed advantage by their very *corruption*; and look as the *body is ſowne in diſhonour, raiſed in glory*; *ſown in weakneſs, raiſed in power*; ſo are the *Spirits* of Chriſts members ſo much the quicker, fairer, firmer, after they have been touched and tainted with thoſe corruptions: *Former corruptions* being made to contribute to their *future purity*; and their *fall* giving occaſion of their more *happy riſing*, and *ſurer ſtanding*. But by your leave; there is not the ſame reaſon of *Corporal* and *Spirstual* corruptions; thoſe are not ſo odious as theſe: there is nothing of *enmity againſt God*, nothing of *hatred againſt Chriſt* in *thoſe*, there is in *theſe*: and therefore though it be [no diſparagement to Chriſt, that his members are ſubject to thoſe;] it is, to ſay they are ſubject to theſe ſo as to periſh: a *capacity of periſhing* we acknowledge, in reſpect of their *owne frail temper*, we maintain an *impoſſibility* of their periſhing in reſpect of Chriſts tranſcendent *power*. We yeild, they are ready to *mangle*, and little leſs then *diſmember* themſelves; but Chriſt is alwayes *able*, and when it makes moſt for his glory and their comfort, all as *willing* to heal and reſtore them. Can it ſtand with the honour

of this great Phyſician, to be either unable or negligent to keep his *owne members*, from *rotting* and *falling* off? to let now *one finger* drop off into the *dirt*, anon *another* into the *fire*, to wear one ſleeve, as it were without an *arme*, to have but half a *foot* in one ſhooe, to go up and down without a *noſe*, or to have one *ear* cropt: He who takes care that not one of our *hairs* ſhould fall without his Providence, will ſee ſure that none of his own *members* ſhould *periſh*. The head of the Church may not loſe an *hair*, much leſs a *hand*.

SECT. 39. Jude ver. 1.

To that of *Jude*, ver. 1. *To them that are ſanctified by God the Father, and preſerved by Jeſus Chriſt, and called.* You anſwer,

[1. That it is not denyed, but that Chriſt doth preſerve his Saints, and that with much care and tenderneſs, yea, and watcheth over them for good. The queſtion (you ſay) is, Whether he impoſeth an unconquerable neceſſity upon them of perſevering in faith unto the end. The ſimple preſervation of the Saints, is all that can bee concluded from this Scripture; the manner of it, or the terms upon which it is performed, are not at all ſo much as imtimated here.]

It is enough that here is mention made of their preſervation; the manner can be no leſs then by impoſing an [unconquerable perſevering in faith unto the end;] without *this*, how much is there *within*, were there never ſo little *without* them, that would reſiſt all Gods endeavors for their preſervation? did he endeavor it only by arguing, or perhaps exciting, as you call it, that is at moſt but more prevalently arguing; the *fleſh* would ſoon find quirks to elude all the moſt irrefragable demonſtrations of the *Spirit*, nothing leſs then *caſting down high imaginations*, and *bringing thoughts into Captivity*, is able to compaſs this grand work of their preſervation. Nothing leſs then a *power over Satans will* to keep him from ſetting upon them, as far as he would, and a power over the *Saints wills*, to keep them from yeilding to Satan, as they too often would, is able to effect it. Beſides, did God preſerve the Saints only by ſuch meanes as you pleaſe to intimate; he preſerves the *Wicked* as well as the *Saints*, they all ſharing alike in ſuch means of preſervation; nay, to what purpoſe ſhould the Apoſtle add *preſerved* after *Sanctified*, unleſs this *Preſervation* ſignified ſomewhat elſe then a bare *Sanctification*, even a keeping of that Sanctification from degenerating, (as it ſoon would, were it not for the Omnipotent influence of Gods Spirit,) into Apoſtaſie and Rebellion?

2. Say you, [The Particle τετηρημένοις. *Preſerved*, being of the Preterperfect Tenſe, imports only, that the perſons to whom he ſpeaks, had been (*viz.* hitherto) preſerved or kept by Jeſus Chriſt, or for Jeſus Chriſt, for ſo the words will bear; not that he intended whatſoever their miſdemeanors in ſin ſhould be, to preſerve them in faith unto the end.]

I anſwer, That the Particle, though it *expreſs* only a Preſervation paſt, yet it *infers* alike preſervation to come; the ſame power which had kept them *hitherto*, was as able to keep them *hereafter* and for *ever*; and whether it be *by* Jeſus Chriſt, or *for* Jeſus Chriſt, it is not material; but both being ſignified, as you ſay, the preſervation is the more manifeſted: *by him* and *for him*; by his *Power*, for his *glory*; *of him*, and *through him*, and *for him* is all things. Not that he intended to preſerve them in faith to the end, whatſoever their miſdemeanors in ſin ſhould be; but he intended to preſerve them *from ſuch miſdemeanors as ſhould be* of that quality as to *deſtroy their faith*. We ſtand to *this*, That *Chriſt preſerves his people from ſin*, not that they may expect preſervation from him *in ſin* of all *ſizes* and *degrees*. And whereas you talk of [aſſurance that they ſhould be preſerved in the faith, whether they contend for it or no;] it is but an old ſlander of yours. We ſay, *Contending* is neceſſary to *confirming* in the faith; but add, that this *Contending* is from God alſo, and that againſt all poſſible interveniencies. God helps them to *contend* and helps them as *inwardly* by his Spirit, ſo *outwardly*, by propoſing the examples of ſeverity againſt the unbelieving Iſraelites and Apoſtatizing Angels. The Exhortation to contend for the faith, and the examples of the Iſraelites and fallen

Angels

Angels; ſuppoſe I grant [a liableneſs in the Saints, both to ſin and ſuffer for ſin,] but that liableneſs is only in reſpect of their owne Corruptions, and is notwithſtanding over-ruled by Gods Grace, and the Grace of God uſeth both Exhortations and Examples, as means whereby to over-rule it. And this may ſerve for your new carving us of your old diſh.

SECT. 40. 2 Tim. 1. 12.

[The next place, 2 *Tim.* 1.12. acquaints us with the Apoſtles ſpirit, as far as theſe words will extend, *I know whom I have believed, and I am perſwaded, that he is able to keep that which I have comitted unto him againſt that day.* This Text (ſay you) of all the reſt is eccentrical to the buſineſs in hand, for it ſpeaks only of the power of God to keep, whereas this never came within the verge of the queſtion: or if the will of God to keep be ſuppoſed alſo, neither was it queſtioned by you, whether God be willing to keep his Saints or no? That which you oppoſe is the manner which ſome obtrude, affirming that he doth it in ſuch a manner, as neceſſitates their Perſeverance; and certain you are, that the Scripture in hand gives no ſuch ſound as this.]

I anſwer, 1. That as liberal as you would here be thought in your uſual and conſtant grant of [Gods *Power* to keep the Saints,] you elſewhere flatly enough deny it; and indeed you muſt, upon your good principles of ſuch a liberty of mans will, as would be prejudiced by this *Power of God.*

2. The ſame I ſay of the *Will* of God to keep his Saints: as auguſtly as you would ſeem to ſpeak of it, you mean no more all along your Diſcourſe then a will in God to keep them from Hel, if they themſelves *keep themſelves from ſinning*; or at moſt but a will in God to keep them from ſin, if they will have a care to keep themſelves; that he will not be wanting to them by good Exhortations, if they be not wanting to themſelves in the uſe of them. But

3. If you will aſcribe unto God *ſuch a keeping* as is worthy of God, and uſeful to man, it muſt be ſuch a keeping as [*neceſſitates the Perſeverance of the Saints*] by a ſweet violence overmaſtering their corruptions, changing their nature, inclinations, and carrying them ſafe to Heaven through all oppoſitions whatſoever. And this is that which the Apoſtle intends upon the place, where having ſpoken of Gods bringing *life and Immortality to light through the Goſpel*, he adds, *Whereunto I am appointed a Preacher, and an Apoſtle, and Teacher of the Gentiles*; in doing which Office, he was ſure to encounter varieties of oppoſitions, whereby in ſtead of bringing others to the Faith, he would be tempted to deſert it *himſelf*, and to loſe his *Faith* to ſave his *Life*; but ſaith he, *I know whom I have believed, and I am perſwaded that he is able to keep, &c. i.e.* I have believed Gods *Promiſe to keep my Faith*, that *my Soul* may be ſafe. His *Power* I can demonſtrate, I *know and am perſwaded* upon ſuch conſiderations, as the very light of Nature diſcovers; that, that tells me, he is Omnipotent, and his Omnipotence renders him able; and his Will I believe many wayes declared to me in that Goſpel which I preach by his Commiſſion, he aſſuring me of preſervation from all Adverſary Powers; what am I the better if I be preſerved for my body, if not for my ſoul? Yea, I expect to have my body one day ſacrificed on this ſervice of the Goſpel; it is my *happineſs* that my ſoul ſhall be ſecured. But ſay you,

[That *depoſitum* or thing committed by him unto God, which the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of, was not his faith; this can in no very tolerable ſenſe be ſaid to be committed unto God, but rather his ſoul, which he committed to the care and ſafe keeping of God.]

Be it yeilded, he ſpeaks of [his *ſoul* that was committed to God,] *that* could not be kept by God, but by preſerving his *Faith*, which being loſt, his *ſoul* was loſt alſo: therefore that God might keep his *Soul*, he was to keep his *Faith*. And why could not his *Faith* be ſaid in a very tolerable ſenſe, to be *committed to God*? Do we not commit *that* and all our other *Graces* to him to be kept? *Keep our hearts in the love of God*, is as much as *keep the love of God in our hearts*; *preſerve us blameleſſe*, is as much as *keep our Faith and Charity.* God, as he

is the *Authour*, ſo the *Preſerver* of our Faith. You (it ſeems) owe him not upon that account.

[You go on, Nor is there the leaſt doubt or queſtion to be made, but that God was both able, and willing to keep this; *viz.* his *ſoul* ſafe, as long as the Apoſtle was deſirous and willing to intruſt him with it, and to ſuffer it to lye in his hand. But this proves not, but that the Apoſtle was at liberty to have recalled or taken back this his *depoſitum* out of the hand of God, in which caſe he had been diſcharged from taking further care of it.]

What I pray mean you by the [Apoſtles being willing to ſuffer his ſoul to lye in Gods hand?] Mean you, in the hand of his Providence? it muſt needs have lain there, whether the Apoſtle had been *willing* or *no*; or in the hand of his *Precepts*? What is that? God ſtill keeps a hand thus over *every man*, whether he *keep Gods Precepts or no*: You can mean but this, *God was willing to keep Paul to the keeping of his Precepts, if Paul were willing to keep himſelf to it*; a rare boon. But ſay you, [If the Apoſtle, according to his liberty, had taken back this his *depoſitum* out of the hand of God, God had been diſcharged from taking further care of it.] Alas Sir, Gods Promiſe is to keep our ſouls from the injuries they would receive from our *own hands*, as well as *others*; to keep us from *our ſelves*, when we go *back*, to heal our back *ſlidings*: it is the chief part of our comfort, that God hath engaged himſelf to be more a friend to us, then we could be to *our ſelves*; yea, to be ſo *great a friend to us*, when we would be *deadly enemies to our ſelves*. *Paul* had *within* him, *a Law in his Members*, as well as lawleſs Adverſaries *without him*. His *own fleſh* would have been as dangerous an Adverſary, as any *ſpirit* in the world; his own *sheepiſh cowardiſe* would have undone him, as ſoon as the *devouring Lion*: it had been little happineſs to have been preſerved from *others*, and to have periſhed by himſelf.

SECT. 41. Heb. 12. 2. [Whereas *Heb.* 12. 2. Chriſt is ſtiled the *Author and Finiſher of our faith*, or rather of the faith, τῆς πίστεως, it doth not imply any acting of Chriſt in, or about our faith in a Phyſical way, or with any efficiency properly ſo called; much leſs with any neceſſitating influence; but that he was an abſolute or perfect Captaine or Leader in that way of faith, wherein we all ſtand bound to follow him at the peril of our ſouls. He was not diſmayed, diſcouraged, he was daunted at nothing which he was called to ſuffer or endured in his courſe, but with an excellent and unconquerable ſpirit, held on his way, through the midſt of thoſe threatning, and devouring afflictions, which incountred him, until he came where glory and bleſſedneſs waited for him, and attended his coming.]

That much of this is *true*, I yeild, that this is *full*, I deny. Let Chriſt be ſtiled the Authour and Finiſher of [*the* Faith.] I hope that is as much as *ours*, no leſs then the faith of *all the people of God*; they all have it from him, they all have it *kept by him:* and had they it given at firſt, or kept to the laſt, [without any acting of his about it, with any efficiency properly ſo called?] take away your *Phyſical efficiency* for once; we ſay it is *hyperphyſical*, and ſuch as is *neceſſitating*, ſo far, that the effect cannot but follow in regard of the *prevalent power of grace*, all oppoſition that is made by our corruption notwithſtanding. I hope this is no diſhonour to the *Captain* of our ſalvation: but for his being the *example of faith*, ſuch as is neceſſary to Salvation, is *infinitely* below *him*. Did he truſt in God, trow you, for *forgiveneſs* of ſins? This is the maine part of *our faith*, to rely on that gracious Promiſe that our ſins ſhall not be laid to our charge. Did he truſt in his *own blood*, in his *own merit*? *ſuch a faith* as muſt bring us to *Heaven*, Chriſt was no way capable of on *earth*, nor ſhall *we* be when we come to *Heaven*: ſo that he cannot be ſtiled the *Author and Finiſher of our Faith*, as an *example in this kind*. But the Apoſtle perſwading to conſtancy in ſuffering, holds forth not only the example of Chriſt, but likewiſe interpoſeth this as a ſingular motive, that he, as he was the Author, ſo will he be the finiſher of our faith; and this prevails infinitely more for the encouraging of the Saints, apt to be amated with the hideous

ſhapes

ſhapes, wherein their fears are too ready to repreſent variety of evils to them, then all conſiderations of *Chriſts conſtancy whatſoever*. Might they reply? What if Chriſt ſuffered with ſo invincible a Spirit? He had no corruption within him to allay his courage: But *we* poor wretches are ſenſible of the *ſin which doth ſo eaſily beſet us*, and are apt to be betrayed by our *own hearts*, though we were not beleagured with half that hoſt of enemies that beſet us. To take them off from this, the Apoſtle inſinuates, that notwithſtanding thoſe corruptions in *their glory*, Chriſt *conquered* their hearts to the faith, and much more having abated and broken the very *heart* of their corruptions, will he *preſerve* their hearts in the *faith*. He intimates they are to overlook their *own corruptions*, ſo as not to be diſmayed, albeit it concern them to *look unto* them ſo as to *ſuppreſs* them upon all occaſions; and that they are to *look up to Chriſt*, who wants neither power or will to effect in them what he ſo graciouſly had *begun*. As for

The laſt of the Texts cited in favour of the Argument in hand, 1 *Pet.*1.5. you refer the Reader to your *Chap.*10. *Sect.*18. I am pleaſed he ſhould trouble himſelf no farther about it, then to peruſe what I have ſaid upon the place, where I have made it appear, that as much as you boaſt to the contrary, it is of ſingular uſe to us in the preſent buſineſs.

A further Argument, ſay you [advanced by ſome to promote the common Doctrine of Perſeverance (uncapable of preferment) is this.] I muſt ingenuouſly confeſs, I know not to what this pretty Parentheſis of yours doth relate; whether 1. To the *Doctrine*, that *that* is [uncapable of preferment?] Which if ſo, is granted. The Doctrine of *falling*, was for many years the way to *riſing*, the Doctrine of Perſeverance, kept men at a *ſtand*, and only bid them aſſure themſelves of [Preferment] in *Heaven*, and of *patience* on *earth*. The Grandees having ſome of them *practiced* Apoſtaſie in a conſiderable *part*, and intending to do it *fully*, were jealous of thoſe that taught *Perſeverance*, as enemies to their deſignes. Or 2. Whether to the *Argument*, that *that* is [uncapable of Preferment,] and that thoſe that endeavor to prove the Perſevering of the Saints, from the *Sealing by the Spirit*, ſhall never obtain the ſmalleſt *Preferment* under the great *Seal*. Or 3. Whether to *this*, that *this Argument* is [uncapable] of being *preferred* to the ſervice of this *Doctrine of Perſeverance*? And then it ſeems this Doctrine is ſuch, that will not admit of *every ſlender Argument* that would thruſt it ſelfe upon its ſervice. Or 4. Whether to *this*, that this Doctrine will never hold it ſelfe the better ſerved, for being attended with *this Argument*, and after all its officiouſneſs to ſerve it, not vouchſafe it its favour, ſo much ſtate belike doth the Doctrin of Perſeverance keep. What it is, I know not, nor matters it much to enquire; let it paſs for ſuch a Parentheſis, as had it been ommitted, the ſentence would not have had cauſe to complain, and being taken notice of, willbe thought to be preferred above its capacity. Well, let us examine the Argument, which is this: SECT. 42.

They who are ſealed in their hearts by the Holy Ghoſt, that they ſhall certainly be ſaved, can neither totally nor finally loſe their faith: But all true Believers are thus ſealed: Ergo, *They cannot but perſevere without either total or final amiſſion of their faith.*

For the proof of the Minor, theſe Scriptures are produced, 2 *Cor.* 1.21. *Epheſ.* 1.13,14. and 4.30. which all ſpeak of the Obſignation of Believers by the Spirit of God. To this you anſwer,

[1. You diſtinguiſh the Major Propoſition thus, They who are ſealed, &c. that they ſhall certainly be ſaved, &c. *viz.* with ſuch a ſealing as is unchangeable or irreverſible by any interveniences whatſoever, as of ſin, wickedneſs, Apoſtaſie, *&c.* cannot loſe their faith; but if the ſealing be only ſuch, the continuance whereof depends upon the continuance of the faith of the Sealed, and conſequently may be reverſed or withdrawne, it no wayes proves that all they who are partakers of it, muſt of neceſſity retain their faith.]

It

It is enough to reply 1. That the Sealing here ſpoken of, is *unchangeable*, that is, for the *ſubſtance* of the Seal, though not for the *quality* of it; the impreſſion is *indelible*, albeit it be ſometimes *fairer*, ſometimes *darker*; yea, the Seal, we grant, *may* ſometimes be *broken*, and too often is, but never *broken off*; this Seal is more unchangeable then any *Law* that paſſed under the Great Seal of the Emperor of the *Medes* and *Perſians*. Yea, but ſay you,

2. [That the ſealing with the Spirit, is a ſealing of the latter ſort, which depends upon the faith of the Sealed, is evident by the tenor of one, and by the Contexts and plain circumſtances relating to them all. *In whom alſo* (ſaith the Apoſtle, *Epheſ.*1.13.) *ye were ſealed with the Spirit of Promiſe.*]

The Seal we yeild, [hath a dependance upon their Faith;] but this Seal is the *confirmation* of their faith, notwithſtanding; juſt as the *Seal hangs to the Grant*, but ſo as that the *Grant hangs upon it*, and owes all its vertue and firmneſs to it. I yeild, this Seal was [after their belief,] and it ſignifies that plentiful effuſion of the Spirit promiſed; but this Seal was a *confirmation of their faith*, their faith was not an *invalidating* of this Seal. Now let this *Seal* [depend upon their *faith*,] what hinders but that their *faith* is irrefragably *evidenced* by this *Seal*? *Riſibility depends* upon *rationality*, yet is *riſibility* a *demonſtration* of *rationality*, beyond all poſſibility of exception. Let this Seal depend, in reſpect of the *beginning*, and alſo *perpetuation* of it, upon *faith*: if that there be a neceſſary dependance of this Seal for the *perpetuation* of it upon faith, and the perpetuation of the Seal be evident, it is as evident that the perpetuation of *Faith* is equal to that of the Seal. And thus, albeit the Argument drawn from the Seal to the Faith, be [*ab effectu ad cauſam*,] yet is the Argument all as ſtrong, as if it were drawn from the Cauſe to the Effect; the *Effect* as infallibly demonſtrating the *Cauſe*, as the *Cauſe* doth the *Effect*. And becauſe [a Believer, if he make ſhipwrack of his faith, is far more uncapable of this ſealing then he was before his believing,] and this Seal is a Seal of *Perpetuity*; therefore it follows beyond contradiction, that it is *impoſſible a Believer ſhould ever make ſuch ſhipwrack of his faith.*

SECT. 43. [Now that this Seal is of ſuch perpetuity, the ſealing of the holy Spirit of God againſt the day of Redemption, and the giving of the Spirit in their hearts, as an earneſt of their inheritance, until the Redemption of the purchaſed poſſeſſion, import; and that the ſealing of the Spirit once granted unto Believers, is granted upon ſuch termes that it ſhall continue in them, and upon them, until their Reſurrection unto life and glory.

Here 1. You yeild, [That it is granted, with an intent and purpoſe on Gods part, that it ſhould remain perpetually with them; ſo that if there be an interruption or cancelling of it, it ſhall not ariſe from any variableneſs or mutability in him, nor from any change of mind or affections in him, from what he was, in both, when he firſt vouchſafed it unto them.]

If ſo (ſay I) then *his* being conſtant to Believers, will cauſe the Believers to be conſtant to *him*: *his Power* being ſeconded with *his will* to do them good, equal to what he had, when he firſt ſet his Seal upon them, will alwayes preſerve this Seal inviolable and uninterruptible. But

2. You except and ſay, [That the ſealing we ſpeak of, is never granted by God unto Believers themſelves upon any ſuch terms, that upon no occaſion whatſoever, as of the greateſt and moſt horrid ſins, committed and long continued in by them, or the like, it ſhould never be interrupted or defaced.]

But (ſay I) it is upon ſuch termes as to keep them from committing, or at leaſt long continuing in ſuch horrid ſins: and whiles they continue in ſuch ſins, the Seal (it is true) is [*defaced*;] but it followes not, it is *broken off*; they find the leſs *comfort*, the leſs they perform their *duties*, and much leſs when they break out into ſuch [horrid ſins;] yet the ſins which ſeem *ſlight* to *others*, are *horrid* to *them*, and fill their hearts with *grief* proportionable to the *comfort* they enjoyed before, and the more, for the *preſent loſs* of their *former comfort*: but ſtill they have ſo much

much of the Seal undefaced, as puts them upon hope of receiving a *Pardon*, yea, and makes them find ſome ſecret *comfort* in their [very *ſorrow* for ſins:. nor is this contrary to any of thoſe Texts; wherein [Apoſtates from God, or evil doers are threatned with the loſs of Gods favour, and of the inheritance, or the like.] Theſe *threatnings* ſhew the favour of God is not *yet loſt*, for what ſhould he *threaten* that Judgment, which is already *executed*? Yea, theſe Threatnings are uſed as *means* to keep thoſe who Apoſtatize in *part*, from Apoſtatizing *totally*, and to keep theſe *evil doers* from periſhing in *evil doing*, and to reclaim them from *evil*, and reduce them to *good*. But you proceed,

3. [Therefore Believers are ſaid to be ſealed by the holy Spirit of God *againſt*, or *until*, or *for*, εἰς, the day of Redemption, 1. Becauſe that Holineſs, which is wrought in them by the Spirit of God, qualifies them, putting them into a preſent and actual capacity, of partaking in that Joy, Bleſſedneſs and Glory, which the great day of the Plenary, and full Redemption of the Saints, *i. e.* of thoſe who then ſhall be found ſuch, ſhall bring with it.] Right. [2. Becauſe it is binding or obliging on Gods part, as well in reſpect of his promiſe, as of the nature of the thing it ſelf, being ſomewhat for kind and property of that undefiled Inheritance which he hath promiſed unto holy perſons, and which is reſerved for them in the heavens.]

This laſt clauſe would have been left out: How any thing [in the nature of it can lay a bond and obligation on God,] Mr. *Goodwin* ſhall much bind and oblige us, when he ſhall vouchſafe to indoctrinate us: The reſt I grant, and it ſpeaks nothing to our prejudice, but this ſolemn putting Believers into an [actual capacity of the Glory of Heaven, and being a bond and obligation on God, upon his Promiſe,] without the addition of any tye that it layes upon him, [in its owne nature,] to preſerve them to heaven, fairly makes for the *Perſeverance of Believers*.

But ſay you, [As Earneſts given and received amongſt men, though they be engaging and obliging on both ſides, ſimply, and in caſe of a non-intervention of very material circumſtances, in order to the breaking or diſſolving of the Contract ratified by them; yet are they ſeldome or never engaging or obliging on either ſide upon ſuch termes, that no poſſible interpoſition, whether of Providences or other things, can diſcharge them. A Contract of Marriage, ratified and confirmed by both parties, with earneſt given and received, may notwithſtanding lawfully be diſſolved upon an act of Adultery commited by the one party, if the other pleaſeth: there is the ſame conſideration likewiſe of confirmation by earneſts in other caſes.]

Where is yonr *ſo*? Apply noble Sir, and we are ready to pay you your deſerved thanks. But I humbly beſeech you to conſider, whether it be the ſame caſe for [Earneſt given and received among men, upon a previous agreement on both parties,] eying, as it is to be ſuppoſed, their *own intereſt*, and *this* given *freely* by God, only for the aſſurance of his favor to be continued to his people, who had nothing in them that could pretend to deſerve it. [Earneſts which are given and received among men,] are given upon a *condition* to be performed by the *one* party, whoſe heart is not in the *hands* of the *other*; but God hath the *hearts* of his *Servants*, *all* of them in his own *hand*, and is, I truſt, *able* to make them perform the *condition*; and knowes full well, that *without him* they *cannot* ſo much as *endeavor*, yea, or *deſire* to perform it. The *man* who *gives Earneſt*, may perhaps ſee cauſe rather to *loſe his Earneſt*, then *hold his Bargain*, upon ſome better conſideration. What thinks your Reverence, is this incident to God? The *man* who hath *received the Earneſt*, is a gainer of as much as the Earneſt, though the other party break the *Bargain*, which it is to be ſuppoſed he will not do; but that hee ſees it will be leſs diſadvantagious to him to loſe his Earneſt, then ſtand to his Bargain. Is this the caſe of Believers? What if [a Contract of Marriage, ratified and confirmed by both parties, with earneſt given and received, may be diſſolved upon an act of Adultery, committed by the one party?] the *other* party,

could

could he have made the *Adulterous party honeſt*, would have done it, we may preſume. Say, Cannot God keep his Spouſe from thus abuſing *him* and her *ſelf*? Your Diſcourſe of [Earneſts,] hath in earneſt little of reaſon in it; and the difference between theſe caſes and ours, is all as wide as Heaven and earth are diſtant.

But [4. And laſtly, (ſay you) If the Apoſtles intent had been to inform the *Epheſians*, that the gift of the holy Spirit, which they had received from God, was the earneſt of their inheritance, upon ſuch termes that no unworthineſs or wickedneſſe whatſoever on their parts, could ever hinder the actual collation of this inheritance upon them, he had plainly prevaricated with that moſt ſerious admonition, wherein he addreſſeth himſelfe unto them afterwards, *For ye know that no Whoremonger, &c. ſhall inherit the Kingdome of Chriſt, &c. for ſuch things comes the wrath of God upon the children of Diſobedience.* To what purpoſe ſhould he thus ſeverely diſcipline and nurture thoſe, in order to the eſcaping the wrath of God, whom he had a little before aſſured that there was no danger, no poſſibility of their falling under the wrath of God, or of their miſcarrying in point of Salvation?]

You are ſtill at your old miſtake, as if we taught, *That no wickedneſs whatſoever could hinder the collation of the inheritance, for which this Earneſt is given.* We ſay, the *Earneſt* is for the *hindering Believers from ſuch wickedneſs* as would *hinder God from collating the Inheritance on them*; and this admonition is uſed by the Apoſtle, as a means to hinder them from ſuch wickedneſs. He had not aſſured them that there was [no danger or poſſibility of falling under the wrath of God in caſe of ſuch wickedneſs;] but only that the favour of God to them, was ſuch, as to preſerve them *from ſuch wickedneſs*, at leaſt from *continuing in it* without *Repentance.* And thus the Apoſtle is far from [prevaricating with his ſerious admonition.] But you, if I may be bold to ſay it, have not a little prevaricated by this ludicrous Argumentation: and ſo I leave it, and proceed.

SECT. 44. A ninth Argument taught, as you ſay, by ſome to ſpeak for the Doctrine of Perſeverance, conſiſteth of ſuch Scripture ſimilitudes, wherein true Believers are reſembled unto ſuch things which ſeem to import the certainty of their Perſeverance; as *viz. Pſal.* 1.3. they are compared to a *tree planted by the Rivers of water, which bringeth forth its fruit in its ſeaſon, whoſe leaf alſo ſhall not wither.* Matth. 7.24.25. to *a wiſe man that built his houſe on a Rock, ſo that though the raine fell, and the flouds came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that houſe, yet it fell not.* Luke 8.8. to *ſeed that fell upon good ground; which ſprang up, and bare fruit an hundred fold.* To this you anſwer,

[1. In *General*; That no ſimilitude whatſoever, whereby the proſperity, ſafety, or glory of the Saints of God, are ſet forth in the Scriptures, doth any wayes reach the point in queſtion: becauſe the queſtion is not, Whether the Saints, abiding ſuch, ſhall ſtand for ever in the greateſt proſperity, ſafety, and glory? but whether thoſe who are once Saints, muſt neceſſarily continue ſuch, and not degenerate into any other kind or ſort of men for ever?]

Yea, but I reply, Theſe Scriptures ſpeak of the continuance of the Saints *in holineſs*, and of the proſpering of their *ſouls*, not of their *outward eſtate:* and ſure the Scripture doth not uſe to ſay much of the Saints [*abiding for ever in the greateſt proſperity, ſafety and glory,*] in reſpect of *worldly things*, ſuch a glorious meaſure ſeldome falls to the lot of the Saints: and if this proſperity be meant of the proſperity of their *ſouls*; I demand, Is it meant of the proſperity of their ſouls in *this world*, or *that to come*? not of the proſperity of their ſouls *in that to come*; for here is mention made in two Texes, of fruit brought forth in *ſeaſon*; heaven is not the place for that: in another, of the ſtanding of the houſe, notwithſtanding the *rain, flouds, and winds*; there is no place for *ſuch in heaven.* So that it is clear, it is not meant of the proſperity of the *Saints in Heaven.* Now if it be meant of the proſperity of their *ſouls on earth*, then it is meant of the continuance of their

Saintſhip,

Saintſhip, and this is the principal part of their proſperity, that in ſpight of all oppoſition they ſhall remain *holy*, and their *holineſs* be their *happineſs*, and make *what ever they do to proſper*; not in it *ſelf*, but as to *them*, who *proſper* by *miſcarriages*, grow *rich* by *loſſes*, are made *ſtrong* by *weakneſſes*, *live* by *dying*. And thus even *theſe ſimilitudes* evince ſomething, at leaſt, as little as we are wont to attribute to them in point of Argument. You anſwer,

[2. In *Particular*. And

1. That the compariſon of a man *delighting in the Law of the Lord*, Pſal. 1. to the tree there deſcribed, doth not ſuppoſe that he can never ceaſe delighting in the Lord, nor is any ſuch thing ſignified by the non-failing of the leafe; but the purport of the ſimilitude is only to ſhew, that the condition of a perſon, eſchuing evil, obſerving the Law, and continuing ſuch, ſhall be ever proſperous and bleſſed.]

I anſwer, No: The deſign is to ſhew the *continuance* of the good in *obſerving the Law*, as the *foundation*, as well as their *proſperity* in that *continuance*, as the *Superſtructure*; and their *continuance in doing their duty*, is much more fully expreſſed, then their continuance in *enjoying other comforts*. He *ſhall be like a tree*, and that *planted by the Rivers of water*, that *brings forth his fruit in his ſeaſon*; and more, his *leaf alſo ſhall not wither*, that is more then *not fall*, (and all this ſeems to relate to *doing his duty*;) and *whatſoever he doth ſhall proſper*, is the only paſſage that ſpeaks a *reward*: now that is true only in the ſenſe given before, *proſper* ſo far as to make him *perſevere in doing his duty*; but who but a *Saint* would look upon *perſecution* as *proſperity*? to be diſhonoured, defrauded, is to *proſper* (would the world ſay) with a *vengeance*, yet thus doth the *generation of the Godly proſper in moſt ages*; the more *fruitful* trees they are, the more they are *ſhaken*, the more they are *loden*, the more they are *cubited*; while an *Elme* or an *Apſe* ſtands quiet, as being barren, every boy hath a fling at a *Fruit-tree* that ſtands in the *way*. The Godly *proſper in this*, that *all* their *evils* work together for *good*; and the more evil they *ſuffer*, the more *good* they *do* on earth, and *expect* in heaven. *This* is the glory of the *Godly*, to be as a *tree planted by the Rivers of waters*, and ſo ſure enough to thrive in the *dryeſt*; and *parchingeſt*, and *ſultringeſt* Seaſons; when thoſe trees that are fain to depend on the uncertain cheriſhing of the *rain* or *dew*, cannot afford as much as bloſſomes, this tree brings forth *fruit* in his ſeaſon; and whereas *other* trees caſt their *fruits*, this keeps its *leaves*; whereas *others branches* drop off, this hath not ſo much as a *leaf that withereth*; that is, this *good man* doth his duty in the moſt *difficult* times, with an *holy obſtinacy*, being encouraged to it by the ſecret comfort he takes in the very *doing*, and the ſweet teſtimony of his own *conſcience*, as who hath *thoſe Rivers of waters flowing out of his belly*. That this is the ſenſe, appears further by what followes, of the *wicked*. *The ungodly are not ſo, but are as the chaff which the wind driveth away*. *That* this relates to their *lightneſs* and *vanity* in doing when they *do beſt*; not to their *inſtability* in enjoying good, the next words demonſtrate, *Therefore the ungodly ſhall not ſtand in the judgment*; *not ſtand*, for their *ſliding* from the *practice* of their *Duty*, not for not conſtant *abiding* in their *Dignity* or *Wealth*: this falls not under *judgment*, it is that alone which renders them *obnoxious*. So then, as the *chaff here* repreſents not the *ſtate of the wicked*, in reſpect of *ſuffering*, but *vain acting*; ſo doth the *tree* in the verſe above the ſtate of the *Righteous*, not in reſpect of *conſtant enjoying a reward*, but *continual practiſing his duty*. The *Piety* is more intended then the *Proſperity*; yea, *Piety* makes every thing an *Enigmatical Proſperity*; it metamorphoſeth *Poverty* into *Wealth*, *Reproach* into *Glory*, *Priſons* into *Courts*, *Croſſes* into *Crowns*; and makes that which others account a *dull* and *melancholly* condition, the only *pleaſant* and *joyous* one,

But you endeavor [from theſe very words, *Therefore the wicked ſhall not ſtand in the judgement*, to prove that by the *man delighting in the Law of God*, is meant not ſimply that man thus delighting at preſent, but ſuch a man who ſhould conſtantly and with Perſeverance delight ſo; for that by the *wicked man* here oppoſed is not

meant ſimply, ſuch a perſon, who at preſent is wicked or a ſinner, but who ſhould continue ſuch without repentance unto the end.]

Right: but that makes for *us*, that here it is intended, that a man delighting *once*, ſhall delight for *ever* in the Law of God: a wicked man being left to *himſelf*, will ſtill continue *wicked*; a man *brought* by the *Spirit of God* to delight *in the Law of God*, ſhall be ſtill *kept by the ſame Spirit in this delight*. We yeild, That ſhould he leave the Law of God, he ſhould loſe his happineſs; but it is his happineſs that *he ſhall not leave it*, but that the ſame Spirit which *wrought him* contrary to his natural inclination to *delight in the Law*, will *preſerve* him from Apoſtatizing *totally* and *finally*.

SECT. 45. Matth. 7.25. [2. You tell us, there is the ſame conſideration of the ſecond compariſon, *Mat.* 7.25. By him *who ſhould hear Chriſts ſayings and do them*, and in that reſpect is compared to *a wiſe man who built his houſe upon a Rock*; is to be underſtood, not ſuch a perſon who ſhall at *preſent*, and for a time after hearing do the ſayings of Chriſt, and afterwards do that which is contrary unto them, but who ſhall do them and continue in the practiſe, and doing of them unto the end.]

Right: but ſtill the *queſtion* is, Whether it be not meant, that he who doth them at *preſent*, ſhall not be kept by the Spirit of God, ſo as to do them unto the end? Yea, clear it is, that is it which Chriſt here intends, that neither raine, waves, nor winds ſhall beat him off from continuing in doing them; it is not his purpoſe to ſhew that theſe ſhall not beat him out of *Heaven*, but not out of the *way to it*; for why? he goes upon ſuch *principles* as will abide all ſhocks of *temptation*.

[To clear your Interpretation, you alledge, 2 *John* 8. *Look to your ſelves, that we loſe not the things which we have wrought, but that we may receive a full reward*; which words plainly ſuppoſe, that we may do many things of a beneficial tendency and import, (which muſt needs be by doing the ſayings of Chriſt,) and yet loſe the benefit of ſuch doing, by turning aſide out of the way of them, before we come to receive our reward.]

Good Doctor, this Text ſpeaks not of what the *men* had done, who are bid to look to *themſelves*, but of what the *Apoſtle* and his *brethren* had done for *them*; be pleaſed to put on your Spectacles, and read the Text again. *Look to your ſelves, that we loſe not, &c.* in the *firſt Perſon*, not the *ſecond*: as who ſhould ſay, we hope you will be *our Crown* and joy at the laſt day, and that *we* ſhall have a reward proportionable to the benefit you ſhall make of our *labours*; whether you get ought by them or no, we are ſure not to loſe *our reward*, our *endeavors* will be recompenced to *us*, albeit they prove unfruitful to *you*; but we ſhall not think our ſelves *fully* happy, unleſs it pleaſe God we make *you ſo*. See that *we* loſe not much of the comfort of the things we have wrought, but that we may receive a *full reward*; look ye to your ſelves, the compleating of *our joy* depends upon the conſtancy of *your* faith: So that this doth not ſuppoſe a loſs of the benefit of ſuch doing, by the *doers turning out of the way*, but only a loſs of the *full* comfort of ſuch doings by their turning out of the way, for whom theſe things were *done*. Again, if you underſtand it of the ſame men who are bid to look to themſelves, it ſuppoſeth not a *total*, but only a *partial* loſs at moſt; and all the Apoſtle ſeems to fear, is not their *not receiving a reward*, but *not receiving a full reward*; hee ſeems to imply they would not loſe *all*. But laſtly, What if this *looking to themſelves* be the *means to prevent*, even ſuch a *loſs*; and the Apoſtles *Caution* a *means to prevent their not looking to themſelves*; and the Spirit of God ordered the Apoſtles *caution* as a *means* to make them *look to themſelves*, and their *looking to themſelves* as a *means* to *preſerve them from loſing the things which they had wrought*? Look we to your next paſſage, [*The love of many ſhall wax cold, but he that continueth unto the end ſhall be ſaved.*] What of that? The love of thoſe which waxed cold was never *warmed* by the ſanctifying *Spirit* of God. *He that ſhall continue to the end ſhall be ſaved*, is no way contradictious to this, *He that ſhall be ſaved, ſhall*

continue

continue to the end; and he who hath ſaving grace at *firſt*, ſhall have it to the *laſt*. And what if [the *Galatians* did run well for a while; yea, and ſuffered many things for Chriſt and the Goſpels ſake, but afterwards were bewitched and proved diſobedient to the Truth, and ſo fell from that grace and favor of God wherein they ſtood whiles they obeyed the Goſpel?] Why may not all this bee ſpoken only according to mens apprehenſions, who were to judge of the *Galatians hearts* by their *practice*, and Gods *Grace* to them accordingly; not according to the *Truth* and *Reality* of the *Galatians hearts* and Gods *Grace* in them, which they could not ſo certainly know? But of this particular we ſhall have more to ſay, *Chap.* 15. *Sect.* 16.

[The third and laſt compariſon, *Luke* 8.8. hath, you ſay, leſs colour in the face of it then either of the former;] you may well have a ſufficient colour in your own face, when you tell us ſo. In this, they *who receive the word* with *good and honeſt hearts*, are compared unto *ſeed that fell on good ground, which ſpringeth up, and beareth fruit an hundred fold.* SECT. 46. Luke 8, 8.

[1. You ſay, It is not ſaid, *That the ſeed which fell on good ground, are they who* hear *the word with a good and honeſt heart*; but who *having heard* the word, retain and keep it in a *good and honeſt heart.*]

Right; for their hearts are not *good* and *honeſt before* the *hearing*, but are *made* ſuch *by the hearing* of the Word. The *ſeed* is that which *makes* and *manures* the ground; *all ground* is alike *barren* when the ſeed is *caſt upon it*. What get you by this? you that talk of I know not what *goodneſs* in the ground precedantory to the receiving of the *ſeed*, have loſt ſomewhat by this; ſo little cauſe have you to vaunt of an advantage. Well go on,

[The tenor of the place in *Luke*, is this, Τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσιν καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ, So that it is not ſimply the hearing of the word with a good and honeſt heart, that brings men under the compariſon of the ſeed that fell into the good ground; but the retaining and keeping of it in ſuch a heart, and that ſo, *as to bring forth fruit with patience*; *i.e.* with patient continuance in well-doing, whatever temptations they ſhall meet with to interrupt them in their way.]

Very good; but the queſtion is, Whether they, who thus are *made good* by hearing the ſeed, are not *kept good* ſo as to bring *forth fruit with patience*? their *bringing forth fruit with patience* ſuppoſeth them *made good*; their being *made good* makes them *bring forth fruit with patience*; and their *patience keeps* them in bringing forth fruit notwithſtanding whatever *temptations*. And this is as much as we need to ſay. But

2. You ſay, [That our Saviours intent in deſcribing the ſeveral tempers and conditions of thoſe that ſhould hear the Goſpel, together with the events and conſequences of their hearings, reſpectively, by that variety of grounds which the Parable of the Sower ſpeaketh of, was not to aſſert the abſolute neceſſity of the ſeveral events ſpecified upon the reſpective hearings: As if, for inſtance, thoſe who at the time of their firſt hearing were like the thorny ground, muſt neceſſarily miſcarry, and never afterwards believe ſavingly: but to inform the world what is like to be the event and conſequence of ſuch hearings as are here deſcribed, being habitual and of long ſtanding with them.]

Under correction, the intent of our Saviour is to deſcribe what is the [certain event of ſuch *hearings*;] and albeit it be true the *Hearers* may afterwards come to hear in a *better manner*, yet the *hearing* as the *thorny ground*, muſt neceſſarily miſcarry. Now what if there be [no abſolute impoſſibility, that he in whoſe heart the Goſpel is for the preſent incumbred with the cares of the world, may yet recover himſelf from under this great diſadvantage, and ſo believe unto Salvation?] This is becauſe *God may be ſo gracious unto him, as to change his heart*; it followes not, that he who hears with a good heart, and keeps the word, and brings forth fruit with patience, *may loſe his good heart*. Gods goodneſs *changeth* the *bad heart*,

and *keeps the good* as it is; and we are alike bound to bleſs and magnifie his name, for not leaving the bad heart alwayes to *it ſelf*, and for not leaving the *good heart without his Spirit*, which elſe would ſoon grow all *as bad as the worſt*. In the mean time, *this hearing*, ſo as to *keep the word*, and *bring forth fruit with patience*, is made the *property of a good heart*; and hath *much* in it, which may upon rational grounds *keep it good:* whereas the *bad hearts* have *nothing* in them which upon any *rational grounds* may keep them *evil*; a *change* may be wrought upon *theſe* in *mercy* by the *Spirit of God*, a change though too incident to *thoſe* in reſpect of whatever is in *themſelves* when at *beſt*, yet ſhall not be *permitted*; Gods *Truth* being engaged for their *Preſervation*. And thus, as much as you pretend [you have ſhaken the Doctrine of Perſeverance,] even this Argument helps to keep it from falling.

SECT. 47. You caſt about to raze a tenth Argument, built by ſome, as you phraſe it, [for the honour of the Doctrine of Perſeverance] upon ſuch Scriptures which teſtifie that ſuch as do not perſevere, but make either a total or final defection in, or from the Faith, were never true Believers, or by a true faith ingrafted into Chriſt; and that make it the property or badg of a true Believer, that he ſtill doth continue in the faith. The Scriptures produced to juſtifie this account are *Joh.*8.31. 1 *Joh.* 2.19. *Heb.*3.6.14. To this you anſwer,

[1. In General, That there is no good conſiſtency of ſenſe to ſay, That they fall away from faith, who never were at it, never were true Believers:] Nay, but *all faith* makes not men preſently [*true Believers*;] and albeit it be [not ſenſe to ſay they fall from true faith, who were never true Believers, yet is it no nonſenſe to ſay, that [they who never were true Believers,] fall away from an odde kind of counterfeit *faith* which they had, from a *faith* called *Temporary*; or as you word it, a [ſlight and ſuperficial believing,] or rather profeſſion of believing the Goſpel. They may fall away from *true Faith*, as it ſignifies the *Doctrine of Faith*, called by *Lombard*, *Fides qua creditur*, yet never have been *true Believers*, ſo as to have had the gracious *habit of faith*, called, *Fides quâ creditur*. Againſt this you reply,

[1. If this be the faith from which men are ſaid to fall in the Scriptures, then muſt this needs be the faith alſo, wherein they are exhorted and charged to perſevere: for thoſe that have in any knd, or with any faith imbraced the Goſpel, and made profeſſion of it, are exhorteed to continue in the faith. Now that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould perſwade men to continue in a Temporary faith (I mean in ſuch a faith which is not accompanied with Juſtification, or which worketh not by love, or which will certainly fail) imports a kind of impious contradiction.]

Soft, may it pleaſe you Reverence. The *Faith* whence men fall, is the ſame [wherein they are exhorted to perſevere, as this faith ſignifies the *Doctrine, fides qua.* and they who have any wayes embraced and profeſſed the Goſpel, are exhorted to continue in *that faith*, *Fides qua*; that is, in the Goſpel which they have imbraced or profeſſed any way; not in their *way of embracing* or profeſſing it. They are exhorted to *hold* what they embrace or profeſs any way, not to *hold* it in the *ſame way* they do. They are exhorted *not to let it fall*, they are not exhorted to hold it *no better*, or *no faſter*. The Holy Ghoſt may well enough perſwade men to continue even in a temporary faith; in oppoſition to an abſolute abrenunciation of the Goſpel, as which drawes more miſchief upon their heads, and ſcandal to their brethren; but it followes not, becauſe he perſwades them to a contiuuance in a Temporary faith, in oppoſition to an open abrenunciation of the Goſpel; *ergo*, he exhorts them to continue in it, in oppoſition to a true and ſaving faith; he may perſwade them to continue where they are, ſo as not to go *lower*; it followes not, that he encourageth them to continue in it, without going *higher*. He exhorts them not to *caſt away* the truth which they hold lightly, and with the tops (as it were) of their fingers; it followes not, he exhorts them not to *claſp it faſter*, and *hold it firmer*: If their *faith* be not accompanied with

Juſtifica-

Juſtification, their profeſsion of *infidelity*, will be attended with *greater damnation*: If *that* work not by *love*, *this* will work by *hatred*, as all Apoſtates are apt to be deſperate *Adverſaries*: no enemy to the Goſpel, like a Renegado. If *that* will *certainly fail*, viz. to *ſave them*; certainly *this* will not fail to *damn them* to the loweſt pit of hell. Hitherto then here is neither [impiety or contradiction in our aſſertion,] but ſhe is content to bear any language with patience, from ſo venerable a mouth, and will not preſume to retaliate to your horrible gravity: I attend what it liſts to ſay.

[2. If this were all the Apoſtaſie or backſliding from the faith mentioned in the Scriptures; *viz.* to Apoſtatize from a temporary, falſe, hypocritical, dead faith, the ſin of Apoſtaſie would not be a ſin of that deep demerit or high provocation unto God, which the Scripture declareth it to be.]

Your *Reaſon*, may it pleaſe your Worſhip; I cry you mercy, your *Authority* is ſufficient. But is it not [a ſin of a deep demerit,] for a man who pretended to *honour* Chriſt, to *purſue him* with *ſlander*, and his *Servants* (as it were) with *fire* and *ſword*? Is it not [a high provocation unto God,] for a man who *wore* his Sons *Livery*, to *fowle*, yea, *rend his coat*? Is it not ſo much the *departing* from the *terminus à quo*, in his Apoſtaſie, as the *betaking* himſelf to the *terminus ad quem*, that makes the [ſin of ſo deep demerit and high provocation?] but why for all the world, hath [God no reaſon to ſay, *His ſoul ſhall have no pleaſure in them* who withdraw themſelves from an hypocritical, feigned, or unſound faith?] Whether, I beſeech you, do they uſe to withdraw that withdraw themſelves thus? Sure none of them can [withdraw themſelves from an hypocritical, feigned unſound faith,] to a hearty and ſincere faith; it is God alone that withdrawes them to that. If when men [withdraw themſelves from an hypocritical, feigned, unſound faith,] they alwayes with draw themſelves to a cordial, real, deſperate oppoſition of the truth, and the profeſſors of it, hath [God no reaſon to ſay, *His ſoul ſhall have no pleaſure in them?*] it is your pleaſure to ſay ſo; but you will not in haſte give us as much as the ſhadow of a reaſon, why God ſhould have no reaſon to ſay ſo.

3. And laſtly, (you ſay) It is no where to be found in Scripture, either explicitely or implicitely, that they who make ſhipwrack of faith, or prove Apoſtates, were no true or ſound Belivers at any time before this ſhipwrack; but the contrary hereunto will be made manifeſt in due time.] I ſhall expect the time, and at preſent deſire leave to ſay, that you only ſay it, and that you do not ſtoop to that low ſpirited fallacy of *Petitio Principii*, but brave it out in ſtead of begging it.

You are now for a particular anſwer to the Scriptures, upon which this Argument, which you eſſay to pull down, was formerly built. And SECT. 48.

[1. As for thoſe words of Chriſt, *John* 8. 31. *If ye continue in my word, then are you my Diſciples indeed.* You ſay, They do not imply, that in caſe they ſhould John 8. 31. not continue in his words for the time to come, it would argue that they were not his Diſciples at the preſent, but that they could not approve themſelves Diſciples of his, upon thoſe excellent and bleſſed termes, which being Diſciples of his at preſent, they very well might do, and were hereby in a ready way of doing, unleſs they did continue in his words; *i. e.* in obedience unto his Commandments unto the end. For that they were his Diſciples at preſent, without any reſpect to their continuance or non-continuance in his words for the future, is evident from the words immediately preceding, *Then ſaid Jeſus to thoſe who believed on him*; therefore being ſuch who believed on him, they were his true Diſciples, though they had not opportunity as yet to approve themſelves his Diſciples indeed; that is, ſo as to obtain eternal happineſs by their Diſcipleſhip in this kind.]

They were, ſay you, his [true Diſciples, though not Diſciples indeed:] your acuteneſs hath hre cloven a hair: What I pray is the difference between [true Diſci-

Diſciples, and Diſciples indeed,] as much as between a *true man*, and a *man indeed*; a *true Bull*, and a *Bull indeed*. The word *True*, if it relate to *Eſſence* of Diſcipleſhip, is as much as *indeed*: if *indeed* refer to *eminence* of Diſcipleſhip, it is I confeſs ſomewhat more then *true*, as *true* refers to *Eſſence*; but then the *eminence* of Diſcipleſhip is not that alone which puts men into a condition of *obtaining eternal Happineſs*. The *meaneſt* Diſciple, if *true*, ſhall as *truly obtain eternal happineſs*. Theſe mens being *eminent* Diſciples, did not alone qualifie them for *eternal happineſs*. I think the *weakeſt* Diſciple that can ſay, *Lord I believe, help mine unbelief*, ſhall have a *place in Heaven*, and there enjoy *eternal Happineſs*, as well as he whoſe *Faith can remove Mountains*. Will you exclude all from *eternal happineſs* but [*eminent Diſciples* ?] What then ſhall become of the greateſt part of the Faithful? only ſuch (it ſeems) as are *Eyes*, or *Ears*, or *Tongues* in the body of Chriſt, ſhall be admitted to *eternal happineſs*; the *hands* and *feet* muſt be content to go without it; at leaſt only the *greater*, not the *little fingers*, can hope to *lay hold on eternal life*. Sir, every *true Believer* is a *Diſciple indeed*, but every *Believer* is not a *true Believer*, nor every *Diſciple* a *Believer*: a man is ſaid to be a *Diſciple*, as ſoon as he is put to *School* to Chriſt; in his firſt entrance or admiſſion he is a Diſciple; he is not a *Believer*, till he have learned his *principal leſſon* by *heart*, nor a *true Diſciple* till he have learned ſomewhat to *purpoſe* under his Maſter. As every man that is an *Univerſity* man is a *Scholar*, yet your Patrons of *Cambridge* think they ſpeak not barbarouſly, when they ſay of many in their Colledges, that they are *no Scholers*. Shortly, when Chriſt ſaith here, *If you continue in my Words, then are you my Diſciples indeed*: by *Diſciples indeed*, he means *true*, in reſpect of the *right qualification* of Diſciples; and *ſuch a believing*, as many who believed on him were not guilty of; *real, cordial* believing. And this *continuance in his words*, is an *Argument* of ſuch *real* and *cordial believing*; *real* and *cordial believing* is the *cauſe* of ſuch *continuance in his words*, and is ever attended with this bleſſed effect. So that in theſe words Chriſt ſhewes, that only ſuch as do *continue in his words to the laſt*, were *true Believers at firſt*, and that *all true Believers do ſo continue*: which is as much as is demanded by us here, and ſufficiently proved.

SECT. 49. Hebr. 3.6. I am not unwilling to yeild you, that that paſſage, *Hebr.* 3.6. *Whoſe houſe are We, if we hold faſt the confidence and rejoicing of hope firme unto the end*; and that *ver.* 14. *For We are made partakers of Chriſt if we hold the beginning of our confidence ſtedfaſt unto the end*, do not openly contribute much to the confirmation of our Doctrine of Perſeverance; and that you give us the ſcope of the Apoſtle in theſe places, much better then you do in others: but yet theſe Texts yeild us *this*, That *thoſe men who are the houſe of God, and partakers of Chriſt, hold faſt unto the end*, which is enough for our purpoſe. That they yeild ſo much, I make good thus; Men are the *houſe of God, and partakers of Chriſt before their continuance unto the end*, elſe God hath *no houſe, none are partakers* of Chriſt *till their end*; but they are not *made* the houſe of God, or partakers of Chriſt, *by their holding faſt, or continuance unto the end*, elſe they could not be the houſe of God, or partakers of Chriſt *before their end*: *Ergo*, it remains that their *holding faſt*, and *continuance unto the end*, followes their being *made the houſe of God and partakers of Chriſt*; and if ſo, then *all* that are the *houſe of God and partakers of Chriſt, continue ſuch unto the end*; *quod erat demonſtrandum*. Take it clearly thus; *All men who are the houſe of God, and partakers of Chriſt, continue unto the end*: now this *continuing unto the end*, either *followes* their being the houſe of God and partakers of Chriſt, or goes *before it*, or is *ſimultaneous with it*.

1. If you ſay, it is *ſimultaneous* with their *being the houſe of God, and partakers of Chriſt*; then it is either *ſimultaneous in time*, or *nature*, for no other *ſimultaneous* is conſiderable in this caſe. If it be ſimultaneous in *time*, then men are at *one time partakers of Chriſt and continuers unto the end*, which is abſurd; for ſo men either *continue unto the end*, as *ſoon* as they are *firſt the houſe of God, and partakers*

of

of Christ; or men are *not the house of God, and partakers of Christ till the time they continue to the end*; and the *end* being but the *moment* of their *deaths*, they are not *partakers of Christ till then*; which are some of the *absurda absurdorum absurdissima*. If you say, this *continuing unto the end*, and *their being the house of God*, be simultaneous in *nature*, then *retro commeat consequentia*; and so *every one that is the house of God*, and *partaker in Christ, continues unto the end*, as well as *every one who continues holding fast unto the end, is the house of God and partaker of Christ*. what can we desire more?

2. If you say, this *continuing unto the end goes before* being *made the house of God, and partakers of Christ*, then either in *time*, or *nature*; if in *time*, then *men continue to hold fast to the end before they be the house of God and partakers of Christ*, and so God hath *no house*, nor are *any partakers of Christ till after the end of their lives*, and so none upon earth, no not in your own famous Congregation. If in *Nature*, then still of course, *till men continue to the end* they cannot be *the house of God and partakers of Christ*; and their *being a house firm*, is *before* being a *house*; and their being *holders fast of Christ unto the end*, is before their being *partakers of him*; which is as much as to say, the *continuance of a house* is *before the building of it*, and the *holding fast of Christ* is *before the receiving of him*.

3. It remains therefore, that their *continning to the end* followes their *being the house of God*, and their *holding fast the hope*, followes their being *partakers of Christ*. Now how (I pray) doth it follow? either necessarily or not necessarily: If *not necessarily*, then doth not the Apostle argue rightly, for they may be *partakers of Christ*, yet *not hold fast to the end*; and the *house of God*, though not *continue to the end*. If *necessarily*, then have I what I contend for, that *every house of God, shall continue firme to the end*, and *every partaker of Christ hold fast to the end*, which is that I undertook to make good: do your best against it.

——*Volves ruiturum Sisyphe saxum.*

Sir, Let the Apostles scope be what it will, it is enough the Text doth our business, though upon *the by*; and though the Apostle aim not *directly* at perverting our position, yet if he *assert* that, whence we can *prove* our position: we have what we would. ——*Tibi Tantale nulla*
Deprehenduntur aqua.——

As to those words, 1 *John* 2.19. *They went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us, &c.* [We (say you) gave a large account in the preceding Chapter, *Sect.* 21,22. and shewed, that no such thing, is as much as insinuated on them, that they who once truly believe, must of necessity alwayes persevere believing.] I have stated your [account,] and find you very much in our debt; and that you have not performed any considerable part of your engagement. Well, I will have patience to wait a while whether you will pay us better here upon the place. SECT. 50. 1 John 2.19.

Let (for once) the Apostles scope be as you render it to us [to caution them against those Antichristian Teachers, that were abroad in the world, lest they should be seduced by them.] What of this? Why then [it had been very incongruous, and enough to blunt the edge of such a caution, immediately to subjoyn such a Doctrine, from whence they might conclude, that it was a thing impossible for them to be seduced, at least to the making shipwrack of their faith.]

Here you betray your ingenuity, 1. in misrepresenting our Doctrine, which teacheth no *impossibility of the best Saints* being seduced to such a degree; yea, teacheth an *impossibility* of their *not being seduced so*, left to *themselves*.

2. Your Christian Logick in inferring [no need of caution in their standing, because good and sufficient security against falling to perdition from the Promise of God, and his Decree to preserve them.] The Saints argue in a contrary manner, because God who alone is *able*, is graciously *pleased* to secure them, therefore they must take so much the *more*, nothing the *less* heed to *themselves*; and

work

work out their own ſalvation with the more fear and trembling, becauſe it is God who worketh in them, both to will and to do, of his own good pleaſure. Do you think the Saints are apt to *caſt themſelves down*, becauſe God hath promiſed to *hold them up*? Are they ſo *fooliſh* and *unkind*, as to make the Lord ſo unworthy a *requital*? Do yo think they will ruu themſelves upon the *Rocks*, becauſe God hath promiſed they ſhall not ſuffer *ſhipwrack*? I would fain know, whether you ever heard of any, that threw themſelves into the *fire and water*, becauſe God ſaid, *He would be with them in the midſt of the flames and flouds*? Whether of any that had the courage to put their foot on an *Aſp*, becauſe God promiſed the *Aſp ſhould not ſting them*? Sir, Gods promiſe to ſecure the Saints from making *ſhipwrack of their faith*, includes a Promiſe to *make them afraid of running ſuch deſperate hazards*, and to order their converſations, ſo as to keep themſelves aloof from *ſecret temptations*, eſpecially not to ruſh into *apparent dangers*. They pretend not to an *unpoſſibility*, that they ſhould be *ſeduced*, if left to *themſelves*; only to an *impoſſibility* that God ſhould ſo far *deny himſelfe* as to leave them to *themſelves*. Now as for this *impoſsibility*, what is againſt it in the words you alledg here?

[*Let that therefore abide in you which ye have heard from the beginning*; *If that which ye have heard from the beginning ſhall remain in you, yee alſo ſhall continue in the Son, and in the Father.* If (ſay you) there had been an impoſſibility either that *the word which they heard from the beginning*, ſhould *not have remained in them to the end*, or that *they ſhould not have continued in the Son*; doubtleſs the Apoſtle would never have ſubjected the former unto queſtion, nor ſuſpended the latter upon the taking place of it, both which are manifeſtly done by him in theſe words. No man ſpeaks at ſo poor a rate of reaſon and ſenſe as this, *If the light makes things viſible, then may a horſe or a man be ſeen by it.*] The words (I grant) yeild, there is no *impoſsibility of either*; but what whiſper is there, but that *neither* can fall out by reaſon of the *gracious interpoſing of God* to prevent it?

1. The Apoſtle doth not ſubject a *remaining in them of that which they had heard from the beginning* to queſtion; As *if* is not *dubitative*, but *connexive*. It doth not ſubject the *former part* of the hypotheticalPropoſition to *doubt*, but ſhewes that it is a foundation whereon to aſſert the *truth of the latter Propoſition*; he is far enough from *queſtioning* the *remaining of the word in them*, while he affirms that *from the remaining of the word in them*, they might without all queſtion conclude their *continuing in Chriſt*.

2. As for their *continning in Chriſt*, 1. He doth not ſuſpend it upon the words remaining in them; he ſuſpends their *knowledg of their continning in Chriſt* upon the words remaining in them; not their very *continuing in Chriſt*. He ſpeaks of their cotinuance in Chriſt, as *after* the words remaining in them, *in ordine cognoſcendi*, it is *before it, in ordine eſſendi*.

2. If he did [ſuſpend their continuing in Chriſt upon the words remaining in them;] it followes not he implied any thing againſt an *impoſsibility* of their *non continning in Chriſt*, as we ſtate it in reſpect of *Gods purpoſe to preſerve* them in Chriſt. I hope he *can keep the word in them*, and *abſolutely perform* that for them which is *preſented* here as a *condition* of their continuing in Chriſt. Nor is this ſpeech of the Apoſtles thus interpreted of ſo [low a rate of reaſon] as this which you pleaſantly ſubjoin, [if the light makes things viſible, then may an horſe or a man be ſeen by it.] For here, if *things are to be made viſible by the lighte, then a horſe or man may be ſeen by it*; the *Antecedent*, if *univerſal*, as the light makes *all things* viſible, contains the *Conſequence in it*; for *all things* cannot be made viſible by the light. unleſs an [horſe or a man may be ſeen by it.] The *Conſequent* is a *part* of the *Antecedent*, which therefore is *more known* then the *Antecedent* which includes *this part*, and ſomwhat *more*. But the Antecedent if only *particular*, as the light makes ſomethings viſible, will not reach the *Conſequent*; therefore an *horſe* or a *man* may be ſeen by it. For ſuppoſe it were able only to make *ſomething* viſible, it would not be concluded it could make *theſe particulars* ſo; unleſs it appeared

peared that *these particulars* were of the *same nature* with *those other some things*, which it makes visible. So that this is a ridiculous way of reasoning as you propose it, for any mans *indoctrinating*; only for some bodies *non-plusing*, this way of arguing may be *approved*. As if any one should grant, that light makes all, or perhaps some things visible, and yet deny that a horse or a man may be seen by it (as some such froward pieces there are in the world) this way of disputing as ridiculous, as it is in it *self*, would well enough become a *rational man*, as arguing, *Non ad rem, sed ad hominem*. Nor doth he by this make *himself* ridiculous, but shew his *Adversary* to be so: which is indeed the case of a poor Servant of yours here upon the place. But under correction, there is nothing in this manner of speech, [If light make things visible, then a horse or a man may be seen by it,] like to that of the Apostle, *If the word which ye have heard from the beginning remain in you, you shall continue in Christ*; their *continuing in Christ*; and the *words remaining in them*, are not termes that sound the *same thing*, as making things *visible*, and making that things *may be seen*; the words *remaining in them*, relates to their *own practice*; their *continuing in Christ* to *Christs protection*: the *first* relates to what *they ought to do* in reference to *Christ*; the latter to what *Christ pleaseth to do* in reference to *them*.

You strike at another Argument [calculated for the support of the Doctrine of Perseverance, which pretends regulation by many pregnant places of Scripture; which bear that true Believers, who are partakers of the quickning Spirit of Christ and of Regeneration, cannot either totally or finally lose them, or fall away from them. The places levied upon this account are *Rom* 6.2. and *ver.*8,9,10,11. 1 *John* 3.9. and 5.4.18. *Jude*, ver.3. *Apocal.*20.6.] To this you answer, SECT. 51.

[1. In General, that none of the places will be found guilty of the Doctrine wherewith they are charged.] That is to make quick work; and as mercifully as you acquit the *Texts* which are alledged you vote down our Argument by *Lidford* Law, where in the morning they hang and draw, and sit in Judgment after.

2. In Particular. You at first blow off the second place, 1 *John* 3.9. as [answered already.] Let the Reader judg how well; he may review a large discussion of it in the former Chapter.

As for the first place, *Rom.*6.2. *How shall we who are dead to sin live any longer therein?* I yeild, [it shewes rather the unworthiness, then the impossibility of our living in sin after we are once dead to it;] but if you take in the 8. & 9. verses, *&c.* you will find that there is more then you are aware of in this Text for our purpose, *Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him*; if we shall *live with Christ*, surely, then we shall not *fall totally from him*: if we *believe we shall live with Christ*, we *believe we shall not fall totally from him*; if we *believe we shall live with Christ*, upon this ground, *that we are dead with Christ*, then either we believe it *rightly* upon this ground, or *not*; if *not*, the Apostle might have spared his words; if *rightly*, then *our being dead at present with Christ*, is a sure ground that *we shall live with him*; and consequently, this Proposition is true, *They who are dead with Christ at present, shall live with Christ* i.e. *for ever*, which is as much as we contend for. We deny not, the *possibility of our living again in sin*, as to our *selves*; we assert but this, That we are *preserved from living in it again by the power of Christ*. And this is that which the Apostle alledgeth for the strengthning of this ground of our belief, *Knowing this, that Christ being raised again from the dead, dieth no more*: What is this to the point but upon this account, that if we be *once dead*, we shall *live* with Christ for *ever*? It depends not upon any thing in our *selves*. Alas, it is *impossible* but we should, if left to our *selves*, *live again in sin*, but upon *Christs power* engaged to preserve us from this danger of *living again in sin*. Now that this he can do, it appears hence, *Christ dies no more*; ergo, *He can keep us from living again in sin*; if his SECT. 52.

power fail in *this thing*, he may *dye*; for if it fail in one thing, then it may in *another*, and then in *another*, and so in *all*; so that if he have not *power to preserve us from living again in sin*, it is not certain he hath *power to preserve himself from death*: but *we know he dies no more*, therefore we may *conclude*, his *power can keep us from living in sin any more*: now if his *Power* be sufficient, surely there is as much clearness, that he *will use his power* to this purpose; for *his will* is the *same* it was; and he *willed to use his power to make us dead with him*, when we *lived in sin*. What can be alledged why he should be *unwilling to use his power, to keep us from living in sin*, now that we *are dead with him*? And thus have we wrought this Text so, as to raise a sufficient proof of our Doctrine of Perseverance.

All you oppose is That [our Doctrine is diametrically inconsistent with the emphatical energy of the exhortation subjoyned, *Let not sin therefore raign in your mortal bodies*;] but upon better consideration, you will find, that an acknowledgment of a *possibility of our living in sin again*; yea, an *impossibility of our non living in sin again*, if left to our *selves*, leaves room enough for such an *exhortation*. 2. That the mentioning of our *Mortal bodies*, implies the *root of the mischief*; *viz.* that which is apt to draw us into sin again; the *corruption* which still clogs us, while in these *mortal bodies*. 3. That the mentioning of *our mortal bodies*, hints *Christs immortal body*, and *his not dying again*; whose not dying again, argues us before, both *his Power*, and *will* to imploy his power to *keep us from living in sin again*; and so his *Exhortation* rather directs us how to be jealous of the Lusts of our *own flesh*, then to distrust our Perseverance in respect of our preservation by the *Spirit of Christ*, which from the *former* verses is *made good*, and suffers *no detriment* by any thing said in this.

SECT. 53. 1 John 5.4. 1. I can be content to let you have the best of it in your undertakings against the next plea for Perseverance, out of 1 *John* 5.4. *For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory which overcometh the world, even our faith.* I think without much wrong to our Cause, I might yeild you this place; for indeed, 1. We cannot well gainsay but your Exposition is passable; [1. That it signifies only, that all the Sons and Daughters of God, by means of the Spirit of Faith which worketh in them; are 1. at present above the world; and 2. shall continue so, if they continue in the faith, acting and working, as at present.] 2. We do not use to suspend the Perseverance of the Saints, so much on their *faiths victory over the world*, as the Power, Promise, and unchangeable purpose of God, to preserve their *faith* from being *overcome by the world*; not so much in the *Power of faith* to subdue the *world*, as the *pleasure of God* to preserve the *faith of his Elect*, in spight of all the *world*. Yet that you may see you are not victorious in your assaults of our Doctrine even on this side; and that we can make good the place against all the power you bring against it; I say

2. That there is that in the *nature* of faith, which renders it ever, if at any time, victorious over the world; for that the *more the world opposeth it*, the more *strength it gets*; it being in this like a *Palme tree*, the more it is *bowed down*, the higher it *riseth*; and certainly that which is *confirmed* by *opposition*, is *settled* by *shaking*, *growes larger* by what would *cut it short*, *spreadeth* it selfe by being *abridged*, *&c.* can never cease to be *victorious*, seeing it *conquers* by being *beaten*; growes *bold* by being *baffled*; and having gotten the *world well under*, it keeps it the *more under*, the more it endeavors to *rise above it*. We use to say, that the *Rebellion* of a *weaker power* against a *stronger*, doth of course add to its *strength*; and there is no readier way to raise the height of the *prevalent party*, then to draw in the weaker by an unwary *insurrection*, to betray it selfe into its hands. It is just so with the *world*, which being once *conquered by faith*, the more it *stirs*, the more it *troubles*, but withal *advances* the *power* of *faith*, which being once *Conqueror* may be often *foiled*, but never *falls* before the *world*, and when it seems to *fall*, that *fall* helps to *raise* and *exalt* it.

As

As much [diſtreſs] as you have brought our Cauſe into, we need not ſeek relief from *ver.*18. of the forequoted *chapt.*5. of the firſt Epiſtle of *John*, *We know, that whoſoever is born of God ſinneth not; but he that is begotten of God, keepeth himſelf, and that wicked one toucheth him not.* We lay not the ſtrength of our Cauſe ſo much on *our keeping our ſelves*, as *Gods keeping us*; nor on the *Wicked ones not touching us*, as *not overturning us*, ſo as to make us *lye downe for ever*; nor on *our not ſinning*; as our being brought to *repentance for ſin.* There is more in this Text then we either need, or uſe to have recourſe to. But let us ſee how you render it all as nothing, and blow it downe with a breath. SECT. 54.

1. Say you, [The Text ſignifies no more then this, That the property of a true born child of God, as ſuch, and whiles ſuch, is to refraine from cuſtomary practices of ſin.] A child *once born* is, (I think) for ever ſaid to be *born of God*, and cannot be unborn; not that ſuch vigilance and care is alwaies taken by him: if as long as he is γεγεννημένος, ſuch vigilance be taken by him, ſurely then alwayes; for he cannot be ἀγεγεννημένος, unleſs *quod factum eſt infectum, fieri poteſt.* I humbly conceive, it is not ſo much for a man that was once born, to enter into *his mothers womb*, and be *born again*, which Doctor *Nicodemus* thought impoſſible; as it is for a man that was *once born*, *v.*5. ever to make himſelf to be *unborn*: when any can do that, I ſhall preſently yeild, that he *that is born of God*, having put himſelf into ſuch a condition, as that he was never *born of God*, may ſin at ſuch a rate; and be not only *touched*, but *devoured* by the wicked one; in the mean while, we are ſpeaking of what thoſe who are *born of God* do not do: how ſounds this? [Men are often in Scripture dialect ſaid to do that, not which they alwayes do, but which they are apt and likely to do, and which very frequently or cuſtomarily they do indeed, and ſometimes that which is their duty to do.] We are ſpeaking of *not doing*; *He that is born of God ſinneth not*, and you reverendly bring an inſtance *of doing*, That [men may be, and are ſaid to do, what they are apt and wont or ought to do,] helps little to ſhew, that men are ſaid *not to do*, what they at any time *do.* Mens *frequent*, though not *conſtant doing* a thing, may give them a good title to *doing of it*; but if men do *at any time*, though never ſo *ſeldom do a thing*; they cannot, I trow, be ſaid *not to do it*; a *frequent acting* is enough to make good the *Affirmative, they do it*; *any acting* is enough to make void the *Negative, they do it not.* And this is the caſe before us.

2. And yet not to wrong you, albeit your learned obſervation run on the *Affirmative* ſide, yet your firſt inſtance takes to the *Negative*, [If any man walks in the day, he ſtumbleth not; *i. e.* is not apt to ſtumble, or doth not ordinarily ſtumble, though often times he doth.] But this inſtance reacheth not our caſe; the *light of the day*, though never ſo clear, is not a ſufficient cauſe of a mans *non ſtumbling*, or to *preſerve him from ſtumbling*: This *light* is *Extrinſecal*; a man may *walk in the light*, yet not obſerve *all that the light would diſcover* to prevent his *ſtumbling*; or a man may *walk in the light*, and yet though his *eyes* do their part, his *feet* may not to keep him from *ſtumbling.* The light is but an *extrinſecal* and *partial* cauſe of preventing *ſtumbling*; but the *Divine Nature* in every one *that is born of God*, is an *intrinſecal* and *total* cauſe, preventing ſinning in *ſuch kind* as the Apoſtle ſpeaks of; and as for *leſs ſins*, we ſay, they are no prejudice to the truth of our Doctrine, as *leſs trippings* are no over-great *danger* to any man in his walk.

3. All your other inſtances fall into the *Affirmative*, and ſo are not *ad idem*: but when all is done, *he that is born of God*, *ſinneth not frequently* and *cuſtomarily*, and we humbly conceive a *ſlip* now and then will not *undo him* by the mercy of God, nor overthrow our *aſſertion* concerning him.

2. You tell us, [The words will be as well underſtood in a declarative ſenſe, that whoſoever deſires to approve himſelf, (whether to himſelf or others, upon any ſufficient ground) for a man regenerate or born of God, muſt abſtain from ways of ſin.]

Nay rather, the Apoſtle ſhewes, that a mans *approving himſelf* to be *Regenerate*, ſhewes that *his ſins are not unto death*; and ſo it is not ſo much the *neceſſity of non ſinning*, in order to a *declaration of his being Regenerate*, as *ſufficiency* of *his being Regenerate* in order to a *declaration of his ſins being not unto death*, that the Apoſtle here aimes at. He had ſaid *ver.17. All unrighteouſneſs is ſin, and there is a ſin not unto death*; that is, all *unrighteouſneſs* being againſt the *Law*, *deſerveth death* for its *wages*: but yet by the favour of God in the *Goſpel*, there are *ſome ſins* which ſhall never *receive* what they *deſerve*. Now ſaith he, albeit no Regenerate man be free from *ſin*, *deſerving* death, yet *every Regenerate man* is kept from ſin which *brings death*. *He that is born of God, ſinneth not*; viz. *unto death*. And whereas ſome may conceive, that this thought, *That their ſins ſhall receive leſſe penalty*, may draw them to *greater ſins*; he ſhewes it hath a *contrary influence* upon them; it makes them *keep themſelves*, and ſo carefully, that *that wicked one toucheth them not*; not but that he is ever and anon *touching* them with his *temptations*, but he *toucheth them not* ſo as to bring them *by his temptations* to *ſin* ſo, as to be *left in his hands* to receive everlaſting torments.

Now then, upon a full conſideration of the whole carriage of this Scripture, the Apoſtle will be found not only to ſay what helps to *aſſert*, but what alſo, does its part to *vindicate* our Doctrine. 1. It is *aſſerted* in this clauſe, *He that is born of God, ſinneth not unto death*; *hoc eſt, falls not finally*. 2. It is *vindicated* from your exception of [making men ſecure,] he *keepeth himſelf*, &c.

SECT. 56. I apprehend at preſent, that I might let you take the Argument, which ſome (as you ſay) [build upon the Metaphor and Similitude of the Natural birth or generation;] *viz. That as men are capable only of being once born, and cannot loſe the ſubſtance of that nature wherein they are born, or change their ſpecies afterwards: ſo neither are men capable of being born of God more then once, or of loſing the ſubſtance or nature of this birth, being once made partakers of it.* Surely, this Argument ſeems to me, to be not only *lame*, but *gouty*, troubled with both *Podagra* and *Chiragra*: Who would plead thus? *Men cannot be born again*, ergo, *they cannot dye*; the Saints *can be but once Regenerate*, ergo, *they can never periſh*. I know none of our Doctors that ramble after this rate; you but fain a ridiculous Argument, to ſhew how glorious a Conqueſt you can make of it. But Sir, there is ſomewhat in this, as odly as you propoſe it, that is more conſiderable, then to be laughed out of countenance. And that is this, *That it preſſeth your Doctrine of the total Apoſtaſie of thoſe Saints, who you confeſs, did not apoſtatize finally*; for if they were Saints *at laſt*, then they were Saints *all along* from their Regeneration *at firſt*, or elſe they muſt be *Regenerate again*; of which this Argument ſuppoſeth them, and not *gratis*, to be uncapable.

SECT. 57. For howbeit you affirm, [That the Scripture ſaith nothing to countenance the Aſſertion,] yet this *Simile* carries a *little* in it to this purpoſe, and the Texts which you alledge, *nothing againſt it*.

As for [that of *Gal.*4.19. *My little children of whom I travel in birth again*;] it only ſpeaks of *Pauls* ſecond paine, as of a *Woman in Travel*, not of their ſecond generation, as *of a child*. [Gal.5.7. *Ye did run well, who did hinder you?*] ſaith not a ſyllable of a ſecond Regeneration, to the beſt of my apprehenſion: Nor can I divine how there is more in [verſ. 4. *Ye who are juſtified by the Law, are fallen from Grace.*] Is there no *falling* but *total*? and doth *total falling* prove a *ſecond riſing*, and without more ado? Nor do I find much more in [*Heb.*6.4,6 *It is impoſſible to renew thoſe to repentance, who have once been inlightned, in caſe they fall away.*] For what, 1. If *ſome fall away*, and be *renewed*? is *all falling away total periſhing*? or is *all renewing, regenerating*? And what 2. if others fall away, ſo *as not to be renewed*? 1. Doth *their falling away*, and *not being renewed*, prove that others may *totally fall away* and be Regenerate? Or 2. Doth their *falling away, ſo as not to be renewed*, prove that they had *ever true faith*, which

which is the chief prize you have all along run at? Take it, that the Texts you diſpute againſt, do not carry it, [That men can be regenerate a ſecond time.] We ſtand not upon them to prove, that men once *Regenerate, need not a ſecond Regeneration.*

As little weight do we lay upon *Jude*, ver. 3. *The faith which was once delivered to the Saints*; it ſignifies clearly the *Doctrine*, not the *habit* of faith: only this Text helps us to that *diſtinction* which proves the *confuſion* of many of your Anſwers in this Digreſſion. SECT. 58. Jude, ver 3.

But we are much deceived, or thoſe words, *Rev.* 20. 6. *Bleſſed and holy is he that hath part in the firſt Reſurrection, on ſuch the ſecond death hath no power*, carry enough in them to ſupply what is wanting in the *other*. SECT. 59. Rev. 20. 6.

1. The *firſt Reſurrection*, we are ſure, in other Scriptures, not a few, ſignifies the *raiſing of a ſoul from the death of ſin, to the life of Righteouſneſs*; as firſt, *Epheſ.* 2. 5, 6. *Even when we were dead in ſins, he hath quickned us together with Chriſt, (by Grace are ye ſaved) and hath raiſed us up together, and made us ſit together in Heavenly places in Chriſt Jeſus.* So *Coloſſ.* 3. 1. *If ye be riſen with Chriſt*, &c. And that it bears not any other ſenſe here (albeit ſome few learned and grave Authors are of another opinion) is the more general judgment of Divines. I liſt not engage my ſelf impertinently in the diſpute about [the Reſurrection of the Martyrs a thouſand years before that of the reſt of mankind.] But allowing it you for quietneſs ſake, I would fain know, whether thoſe raiſed Martyrs ſhall be above poſſibility of ſinning: And if ſo, whether by reaſon of ſomewhat *in themſelves*, or elſe they owe it to the *good pleaſure of God to preſerve them from ſinning*. If you ſay they are *not above poſſibility of ſinning*, then may they be *under the power of the ſecond death*, that being *wages* due to *every ſin*, and more eſpecially (I ſhould think) due to the ſins of *theſe raiſed Martyrs*; for that as their *Happineſs* is *greater*, ſo muſt their *ſins* be, according to proportion. If you ſay, they are *above poſſibility of ſinning, in reſpect of ſomewhat within themſelves*, then you hereby render them *no free Agents*; and ſo to free them from *this poſſibility of ſinning*, you free them from [*their Native Liberty*,] and make theſe *eminent Saints* to be *caſt down* at their *Reſurrection*, and that below the ordinary rank of *vulgar men*. Alas, if *above poſſibility of ſinning*, according to your maximes, they are *below the common ſort of men*: this liberty *ad utrumque*, and ſo a *poſſibility of ſinning*, being the birthright of all *humane Creatures*. If you ſay, they are *above poſſibility of ſinning, in regard of the pleaſure of God to preſerve them*, though in a *poſſibility of ſinning if left without the influence of God to preſerve them*; you ſay the ſame of [the *raiſed Martyrs*,] that we do of *all Regenerate men*, with this difference only, that you put in *thoſe* an *impoſſibility* of their ſinning in any kind in *regard of God*, with a *poſſibilty of ſinning in reſpect of themſelves*: *We* put in *theſe* an *impoſſibility of ſinning to ſuch a degree*, as *to periſh in ſin* in *regard of God*, with a *poſſibility of ſinning ſo*; yea, an *impoſſibility of not ſinning ſo* in reſpect of *themſelves*. That which we ſay of all Regenerate men, in regard of ſinning, ſo as to *receive* death, is no more then you ſay of your [raiſed Martyrs,] in regard of ſinning, ſo as to *deſerve* death. Surely, if God *can* and *will keep them* from *ſinning at all*, he as eaſily *can*, and ſurely *will keep all but Saints* from *ſinning unto death*. Theſe words, *On ſuch the ſecond death ſhall have no power* (which forſooth, your limit to the raiſed Martyrs) are of no greater latitude then theſe, *There is no condemnation to them which are in Chriſt Jeſus*; which *we* are warranted to extend to *all Saints*. And thus this Text, albeit you conſtrue it of your [raiſed Martyrs, as holding this interpretation marvelouſly probable from the Context,] yet even ſo conſtrued, contributes ſomewhat to the relief of our Cauſe [now in diſtreſs.]

2. Nay, but you immediately plunder us of all our Proviſions, and leave us nothing to put in our mouthes, though we be allowed to conſtrue the *firſt Reſurrection* at our owne pleaſure.

For

For say you, [In case it should be said, that the second death shall have no power on those that are Regenerate, it must according to the constant rule, formerly delivered for the interpretation of such like passages, be understood with this proviso or explication, *viz. if they continue Regenerate, or be found in the state of Regeneration at their death*; which condition, is expressly insisted on in several places, and particularly, *Rev.* 2.11. where our Saviour himselfe, in his Epistle to the Church of *Smyrna*, promiseth exemption from harm by the second death, only upon condition of Victory, which supposeth a standing fast, against all opposition, unto the end, *Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a Crown of life.*]

Be all yeilded you; *this condition* is supposed to be *this, that the second death may have no power*; therefore when it is said, *the second death shall have no power*, it is *implyed*, that they *who have their part in the first Resurrection*, shall have *this condition so necessary* to their being preserved from the *power of the second death*. And thus your Exception is so far from *undermining* our proof for the *certainty of the salvation* of those who have their part in the *first Resurrection*, that it rather *confirms* the *certainty* of their *persevering in Faith and Holiness*; in stead of doing ought to the disproving of the *certainty* of their *glory*, it only proves the *continuance* of their *Graces*.

So little reason have you to shut up this Chapter with such a Pompous Conclusion, [We clearly see, that however the received Doctrine of Perseverance say unto the Scriptures, Scriptures, Scriptures; yet these make no other answer, but *Depart from us, we know you not*; you are a Doctrine that gather not with us, but scatter what we gather.] I desire the Reader but to consider a while, whether if the Scriptures turn off our Doctrine with so much contempt (as you pretend) your learning deserve too much honour, having no better managed the Scriptures in this present Dispute; or if you have managed them to the best advantage of your Cause, that any man hath made (as I have no reason to deny, though many of your learned Neighbors do not care to hear of it) whether Scriptures have not very little to say against our Doctrine; yea, whether our Doctrine speak not to the heart of the Scriptures. Your [gatherings] will be all [scattered] in another sense then this Doctrine, which will not lose a *hair*, let all the Shavers in the world use the best of their Art. If any man could have endangered her, Mr. *Goodwin* had been *He*, having set her foot on the neck of this *Lion*, scorns all the other *Beasts* in the world that shall undertake to oppose her.

Yea, *What shall the man do that comes after the King, against whom it hath been said, there is no rising up?*

CHAP.

CHAP. IV

In Answer to *Chap.* 12. of Mr. *Goodwins* Book, the Fourth of his Digression.

The former Digression prosecuted, and a possibility of defection in the Saints or true Believers, and this unto death, pretended to be clearly demonstrated from the Scriptures.

SECT. 1,2. THE Preface is pleased to insinuate to the Reader, that the Doctrine of Perseverance secretly [gratifies the flesh, and that the Doctrine of Apostasie, riseth up in the cause of Godliness, with a far higher hand: and that albeit the Scripture may seem to speak with a cloven tongue to the point in question, yet which way its heart leaned] you have fully [discovered by a due consideration of that Periphrasis of the Gospel, which the Apostle gives in those words, *The Truth which is according to Godliness.*] But this is no more then what was said more largely, *Chap.* 9. and there as fully answered: and not to trouble the Reader with unnecessary repetitions, I could be content to put the issue of the Controversie upon this particular, as being easily able to evince; yea, I have already sufficiently done it, that *that Godliness* which your Doctrine of Apostasie can hope to advance, is but a *dull* and *earthly spirited Godliness*, a *selfish* kind of *Godliness*, a *Godliness* which is not without some frequent touches of *hatred of God*, whom it serves only out of *fear*; whereas that which ours endeavoureth to promote, is a more *generous*, *heroical* kind of Godliness; led on by *Love* and *Hope*, and such as is as far above that *heavy Godliness* of yours, as *Hope* is above *Fear*, and *Love* above *Dread*. *Alas timor hnic, amor addidit illi.*

SECT. 3. You begin to dispute; but first, (according to your customary garb) you brave it out, that [we cannot lightly desire any better account of the Holy Ghosts sense in the question depending, then that *Ezek.* 18.24,25. *But when the Righteous turneth away from his Righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doth, shall he live? All his Righteousness which he hath done, shall not be mentioned, in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, shall he dye. Yet ye say, the Way of the Lord is not equal. Hear now O house of Israel, is not my way equal? are not your wayes unequal? When a Righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dyeth in them, for his iniquity that he hath done shall he dye.* What more (say you) can the understanding, judgment, soul or conscience of a man, reasonably desire for their establishment in any truth whatsoever, then is here delivered by God himself to evince the possibility of a righteous mans declining from his Righteousness, and that unto death? The latter words are conclusive

cluſive hereof againſt, and above all contradiction, *When a Righteous man turneth away*, &c. *and dieth in them*, (*i.e.* repenteth not of them) *for his iniquity that he hath done ſhall he dye, viz.* the ſecond death, and periſh everlaſtingly.]

1. That this *death* here ſpoken of, is *Eternal* I might yeild you; but that there is ſo clear an aſſertion of an [*actual dying of a Righteous man*;] (*viz. one that hath been truly juſtified and ſanctified*) *in his ſins*, is not yet proved: A *poſſibility* of his *forſaking his Righteouſneſs*, in reſpect of *himſelf*, and ſo of *dying in that eſtate*, I grant: A *poſſibility of any ſuch mans forſaking his Righteouſneſs, ſo as to dye in an eſtate of Impenitence*, conſidering *Gods* gracious *care*, and tender *eye over him*, I deny.

2. I ſhall diſpute it, Whether *this death* be Eternal death; and as much as you pleaſe your ſelf in your multitudes of Arguments to prove it, I am not ſatisfied with any one of them, nor perhaps will the Reader be, when he ſhall patiently weigh my Exceptions againſt them. But

1. I ſhall take leave to ſay, That the ſcope of the Lord being here to vindicate his Juſtice from an aſperſion caſt upon it by the Jewes, in puniſhing the children for the Fathers; his plea ſeems to be, as their objection was, of ſuch things as concern their Temporal not Eternal Eſtate: I do not find that they objected againſt God that he condemned the children to *Hell*, for the ſins of their Fathers; but that he puniſhed them on *earth* upon that account, and that *the fathers had eaten ſowre grapes, and the childrens teeth were ſet on edge*; as *they* object againſt *God* by this impious Proverb, *an unequal diſpenſation of puniſhment on earth, viſiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the innocent children*; ſo God anſwers *ad idem*, and cleares his righteous *proceedings*, from this *injurious imputation*. And thus all that is here ſpoken, ſeems to relate not to *Eternal death*, but *Temporal*. Well,

2. Let me weigh your Reaſons againſt it. Why, ſay you,

[1. If *Eternal* death be not meant, at leaſt included in this latter clauſe, we ſhall make an unſavory tautologie in the ſentence, and deſtroy all congruity of ſenſe beſides: for then the Prophet muſt be ſuppoſed to ſpeake thus, *When a Righteous man turneth away from his Righteouſneſs, and committeth iniquity and dieth in them, viz.* leaveth his natural life under the guilt of them, and without Repentance for them; *for the iniquity which he hath done ſhall he dye*; *i.e.* leave his natural life, or have his natural life taken from him. When a man dieth for, or under the guilt of his ſin, he ſhall die for his ſin, or becauſe of the guilt of his ſin, the ſame death which he dieth in his ſin.]

I anſwer, 1. That the word of the *Future Tenſe*, he *ſhall dy*, is rendred by *Junius* in the *Preſent Tenſe*, he *doth dye*; and then the meaning will riſe thus, when he dies *in* his ſin, he dieth *for* it; that is, the ſin which he is guilty of at the time of his death, is the cauſe of his death. Now in this I cannot diſcern any intolerable harſhneſs: What abſurdity is it (I pray) to ſay, *When a man being found committing a treſpaſſe, is beaten, hee is beaten for his treſpaſſe.*

2. Let it be read in the *Future Tenſe*, he *ſhall dye*, the *Verb preceding* in the *Preſent* Tenſe, is but equivalent to *this* of the *Future*: Now what incongruity is there in ſaying, *When a man ſhall dye in a ſin, he ſhall dye for it*? that is, that ſin ſhall be the *cauſe* of his death: *When a man ſhall dye eating of poyſon, he ſhall dye by the poiſon*; or *when a man ſhall be ſlaine breaking an houſe, he ſhall be ſlaine for breaking the houſe*. Look upon that *act wherein he dyeth* as the *cauſe* of his death.

I grant you, that [if by *dying* in the latter clauſe be meant *Eternal Death*, the ſenſe runs clear] (for *one part*) [with thoſe paſſages, *Neither Fornicators, &c. ſhall inherit the Kingdome of God*; *and none ſuch have any Inheritance in the Kingdome of God, and of Chriſt*; *and for theſe things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of diſobedience.*] But for the *other* part, That a man once juſtified and ſanctified,

ſanctified, ſhould be left to dye without [Repentance a *Temporal death*, ſo as to incur, as needs he muſt, *Eternal upon it*, daſheth againſt other paſſages of Scripture, all as evident, *that ſuch are kept by the power of God through faith to Salvation*. And therefore I do not find in theſe words any ſuch thing, as that he that *dyeth in his ſin*, ſhould at all be ſuppoſed a man before juſtified and ſanctified; but this *Righteous man* may be ſuppoſed to have been only a *man Righteous in that ſenſe*, as to be *blameleſſe* according to the *letter* of the Law, which *blameleſneſs before men*, may well enough conſiſt with *great unrighteouſneſs* all along *in the ſight of God*. But if this Righteous man be to be conceived a man *once truly juſtified and ſanctified*, it wil be better, yea it wil be neceſſary to interpret this *death* of a *Temporal death*. Doubtleſs, many a man truly juſtified and ſanctified, may *dye for a Tranſgreſſion* committed by him, yea and in that ſenſe *dye in it Temporally*; yet *not dye in it*, ſo as to have the guilt of it charged upon him, ſo as to draw *Eternal death* on him. In how many of the children of *Iſrael* in the Wilderneſs was this verified? their Juſtification did (without all peradventure) deliver multitudes of them from eternal death, and yet the guilt of their murmuring laid their carcaſſes in the wilderneſs by a *Temporal death*. Nor [is it the ſame reaſon to ſay, that though this Juſtification will not deliver a man from *Temporal death*, yet it will from *Eternal*; and that though a true Repentance will deliver a man from *Temporal* death, yet it will not from *Eternal*.] True Repentance doth not alwayes deliver from death *Temporal*, it doth alwaies from *death Eternal*. I ſee nothing hitherto why I ſhould hold my ſelf bound to yeild, that the *death* here ſpoken of is more then *Temporal*; if the *Righteous man* here ſpoken of were ever truly ſuch, juſtified and ſanctified.

Beſides, ſay you, [When God threatneth ſuch backſliders as we ſpeak of, that *when they ſhall commit iniquity*, &c. *all the Righteouſneſs that they have done formerly, ſhall not be mentioned*; *i. e.* as *Calvin* himſelf interprets, *Shall not come into any account* as to matter of *reward*: evident it is, that if it ſhall not come into any account at all; as for example to obtain of God ſo much as the reward of a Temporal deliverance, much leſs ſhall it turn to account, ſo as to be rewarded with eternal Salvation.] SECT. 4.

This I deny: God rewards many a man with *eternal Salvation*, whom he leaves to *Temporal deſtruction*, gives many a good man the heavier meaſure in *earthly things* the *holier he is*, only he ſupports him under thoſe *outward burdens* with *inward comforts*, and the ſweet expectation of that *glorious liberty* whereunto he ſhall be happily *delivered* by the ſtern hand of *death*; it followes not, becauſe God rewards us not for our *Righteouſneſs* with *Temporal*; *ergo*, he will not with *Eternal Salvation*. God often *denies* his ſervants the *leſs*, and *grants* them the *greater* bleſſings; and *for their ſins* withdrawes the *leſſe*, never the *greater*; I meane Salvation. Hitherto I ſee nothing that commands my aſſent to your aſſertion, That [the death here ſpoken of, is more then Temporal.]

You proceed, [Again, that *death* which God here threatneth againſt that double or twofold iniquity of backſliding, is oppoſed to that *Life* which is promiſed to *Repentance* and *Perſeverance* in well doing. But this *Life* is confeſſed by all to be *eternal Life*, therefore the *death* oppoſite to it muſt needs be *Eternal*; or the *ſecond death*.

I deny again, that [the life here promiſed to Repentance muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of eternal life,] Some Repentance hath been rewarded with *temporal Bleſſings only*: What conceit have you of *Ahabs Repentance, and Reward*? As the *death* here threatned to the *Righteous man truly ſuch*, if *ſuch* be to be underſtood, is only *Temporal*; as well may the *life* promiſed to an *unrighteous man* repenting, *pro forma*, be proportionable, *only Temporal*; that is, he is promiſed a *deliverance from Temporal death*, *pro hic & nunc*. True it is, [when the Apoſtle ſaith, *The wages of ſin is death, but the gift of God is eternal*

life; it is evident (I yeild) by the Antitheſis, that he means *Eternal death*;] but though *Eternal death* be the *wages of every ſin*, *every ſinner* is not *preſently* paid, as much as *Temporal death*; and here in this place God is pleaſed to be ſo indulgent, even to a *formal Repentance* of men, none of the beſt, as to *reſpect* the paying them *that part* of their *wages*, and not to inflict *Temporal death* on them, for a faire time, albeit at *laſt* they fail not to receive their juſt due, *Eternal death*.

Yet again, ſay you, [When God in Scripture threatens impenitent perſons with death, doubtleſs he means *eternal death*, or that death which is the *wages of ſin*; otherwiſe we have no ſufficient ground to think, that men dying in their ſins without Repentance, ſhall *ſuffer the vengeance of eternal fire*; but only a *Temporal* or *Natural death*, which the Righteous and truly penitent ſuffer as well as they. Therefore to ſay, that God threatens impenitent Apoſtates in the place in hand, with a *Temporal death only*, when as elſewhere he threatens impenitency under the lighteſt guilt of all, with *Eternal death*, is in effect to repreſent him as vehement and ſore in his diſſwaſives from ordinary and leſſer ſins, but indifferent and remiſſe in diſſwading from ſins of the greateſt provocation.]

1. I deny that [when ever the Scripture threatens impenitent perſons with death; it means eternal death;] it threatens indeed, ſuch as ſhall obſtinately *continue in impenitency all the dayes of their lives*, with *eternal death*; but it threatens not *every perſon*, yea, or *any perſon* that is *impenitent at preſent*, with *eternal death* for his *preſent impenitency*; yea, it promiſeth *eternal life* to every one, who though for the *preſent impenitent*, ſhall at *any time break off his ſins by Repentance*.

2. I deny, That the perſons who are threatned in the place in hand, are ſuch as ſhall all continue impenitent all the dayes of their lives. God threatens here, all ſuch as Apoſtatize with death, he doth not threaten *only ſuch as continue in Apoſtaſie unto death*. A man may die *in* his ſin, that is *for* his ſin, and yet not *in his ſin*, that is *in the commiſſion* of his ſin; the guilt of his ſin may be taken off as to *Eternal death*, and yet may it not be ſo taken off, but he may ſuffer *Temporal death*; not for the ſatisfaction of Gods *Juſtice*, but an example of terror to *men*.

3. Therefore neither doth [the Scripture threaten *elſewhere* eternal death to *all impenitent Apoſtates*,] but only *ſuch as continue ſuch*: nor here doth it threaten *leſs* then *all impenitent Apoſtates*, but therefore threatens them with no more then *temporal death*, as which is common to *all of them*, whether they repent or no: Eternal death is inflicted on none but ſuch as *dye in impenitence*. Now this is not [to repreſent him vehement in his diſſwaſives from ordinary and leſs ſins, and indifferent and remiſs in diſſwading from greater,] but rather ſore and ſevere againſt the *continuers* in Apoſtaſie; yea, *any ſin*, and ſharp againſt *any* committers of Apoſtaſie, though they *returne from that ſin*, as who ſhall not, notwithſtanding, eſcape *death Temporal*; that is, not ſimply *not eſcape death Temporal*, but not eſcape it in a way of *Signal Judgement*. And this takes off your

[Once more, if it be only a Temporal death which God here threatens againſt the ſons of Apoſtaſie, dying under the guilt of their Apoſtaſie, and all the ſins committed therein, without Repentance, then may ſuch men inherit eternal life, not only eſcape damnation.]

I anſwer, Let all be yeilded, That [God threatens only *ſuch men* here, and only with *ſuch a death*; viz. *Temporal*; yet followes it not, [then they ſhall eſcape Damnation,] *&c.* it ſufficeth that they are threatned with Damnation in *other places*, and they may ſuffer *Eternal Damnation* upon the threatning *elſewhere*, albeit there be *no more then a Temporal death threatned here*. The threatning of a *leſs* Judgment in *one place*, doth not prove that a *greater* ſhall not be inflicted according to the tenor of *another*, and the *inflicting* which is more then

then *threatning* of a *greater* Judgment in *one place*, doth not prove that a *leſs Judgment is not only threatned in another.*

[You ſeem to take it for granted, That the Synod of *Dort* acknowledgeth, that men under the guilt of the fowleſt ſins and abominations, may remain in the greateſt love and favour of God, as Juſt and Righteous men; yea, and without Repentance, not onely eſcape Damnation, but inherit Eternal Life.] SECT. 5.

But who will believe any *ſingle man* that ſhall offer to report this of ſo *celebrious a Synod*? [That a man under the guilt of the fowleſt abominations, without repentance, may eſcape Damnation, and inherit eternal life,] would have been the abhorring and abomination of that Sacred Aſſembly: Yea, or [that a man under ſuch guilt, may remain in the greateſt love and favour of God, as a Juſt and Righteous man.] Yet without all peradventure, this they would have yeilded, That God, in reſpect of his *purpoſe to ſave an Elect man*, may be ſaid to *love him*, even *under the guilt of the fowleſt abominations*, and *without Repentance*; for it is *Gods love to him*, that will after in due time *give him Repentance*; and *mans ſins* cannot cauſe God to repeal his *Eternal Counſel*: but no ſober Divine, much leſs ſo Solemn a Councel, would be ſo prodigiouſly forgetful, as to aſſert any love of God in reſpect of his proceedings towards an *Elect man in this caſe*, even in affording him any *comfortable teſtimony of the Spirit on earth*, eſpecially a glorious enjoyment of the *Happineſs of Heaven*; we all profeſs *no entring there without repentance*; only we ſay, that *no abomination that God ſuffers his Elect to fall into*, breaks off his gracious *purpoſe* of bringing them to *Repentance*, and ſo by Repentance to *Heaven*; and that even in caſe of ſuch *abomination* and *want of Repentance at preſent*, they are not outed of their intereſt in Heaven, in reſpect of the *unchangeable Decree of God* paſſed in their behalf from all *Eternity.*

And that comparative alluſion of the *Leper under the Law* (wherewith the Synod of *Dort*, and ſome others, Doctor *Prideaux* it ſeems) ſo much pleaſed themſelves, that they give you occaſion to be *pleaſant* enough with them for it, reacheth full home to the caſe, though it be not called in to help it againſt any Argument from the Scripture in hand.

The Leper (ſay they) *among the Jewes, was enforced, while his Leproſie was upon him, to want his houſe; yet he did not in this time loſe the right of title which he had to his houſe, becauſe upon his cleanſing he might again poſſeſs it.* Thus an Elect man, and Juſtified, falling into an abomination, is not to enter upon any termes into Heaven, and enjoyes not any comfort of the Spirit on earth, during his continuing in this abomination and impenitence; yet doth he not loſe the *right of Title* which he hath to Heaven by the *Decree of God the Father, and purchaſe of the Son*, becauſe upon his Repentance, whereunto he ſhall in good time bee happily brought, he ſhall be readily admitted. Well, what is your Exception againſt this compariſon?

Why [that the caſe is different, upon this ground, that there was no Law made againſt a Leper, that he ſhould loſe the right he had to his houſe during his Leproſie; there is a Law whereby all backſliders from wayes of Righteouſneſs, without Repentance, are cut off from all right of Title or claim to the Inheritance of Heaven. *Epheſ.*5.5. *No ſuch man hath any Inheritance in the Kingdom of Chriſt and of God*; *i. e.* any *right* of Inheritance, or to inherit; for otherwiſe, no Righteous perſon yet living in the fleſh, hath any actual inheritance.]

1. I am bold to deny, That there is any ſuch Law as cuts off all backſliders from all right to the Kingdome of Heaven, other then that which is called, *jus in re*, no Law cuts them off from that, which they call, *jus ad rem.*

2. I grant, The Law cuts them off from *jus ad rem*, upon *their own Title*; I deny that it cuts them off from *jus ad rem* upon *Chriſts title*. Chriſt purchaſed

for them a *right not to be cut off by any sin*, seeing he purchased *Repentance for every sin* they should fall into.

3. I yeild, That this purchase of Christ notwithstanding, they cannot claim a title upon that account *during their impenitence*; but Christ as their *Advocate*, pleads *his own right to them*, and his Fathers Grant to *him* in their behalf; and fails not to sollicite, that they may be brought to *Repentance*, and by that to *Salvation*. So then

4. *No Whoremonger, &c. hath any inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ and of God*, as inheritance signifies possession; not as it signifies *Title* pleadable in Law. *Pro tempore*, this being a *Whoremonger, &c. bears the Action*; but this *Bar being removed* by the great *Counsellor*, the *Title* is good upon the *old Grant*. We are not like to object, as you would have us, [That this Law holds good against such sinners as were never Righteous, not against such as were,] declaim as copiously as you list against it. We say, this Law holds good against *all impenitent sinners*, as to the *jus in re*, and *jus ad rem*, for as much as concernes any right of *their own*; it holds not so against persons *Elect* and *Justified* because of *Christs Right* and *Title*. *These men* have no *right to Christ* for any thing on *their part*, but *Christ* hath still a *right to them*, and will in good time *prosecute his claim*, and *vindicate his right*.

SECT. 6. [Your second Exception against this Comparison of the Leper, as to the case of a man dying in Impenitence; as that, as the Leper dying in his Leprosie, had lost his very right to enter into his house; so the man dying in impenitence (which is the case in *Ezekiel*,) all his right to enter into Heaven] I might well let pass: for that we apply not this to any man *that dies in impenitence*: we say, *No man that was once Justified shall so dye*; and that the Text of *Ezekiel* speaks of a man dying for his sin a *Temporal death*, notwithstanding *his Repentance before his death, ut supra*. Yet even this passage of yours is not overcurrant; for do you think that the Leper lost his *right to his house*, in case he died in his *Leprosie*? He lost his *right to enter into his house*, not his *right to his house*; he was during his Leprosie *Possessor* of his house, though not *inhabitant*; and in that respect I cannot approve Doctor *Prideaux* his expression, *Sanatus, potuit illam rursus possidere*; he had still the *possession* during his *Leprosie*, though he were barred from *dwelling in it*. As I trust, a man *imprisoned for debt*, though his person be held in the *Counter*, yet is not put out of *possession of his house*; if a man lose the *possession of his house all the while it is impossible he should be in it*, then is Mr. *Goodwin* put out of *possession of his own house* every time he *visits his neighbors*. Sir, the Leper, though dying in Leprosie, lost not the *possession* of his house, but dyed *seized of it*, so as his *Heir claimed*, and *enjoyed it* purely in his *Right*. But this being *extra oleas*, I forbear, only I thought fit to intimate it, that you may see you have not too much cause to hold your self too much above any of the Fathers of the Synod of *Dort*, and to value your single Vote, above the general suffrage of so many singular Doctors, and who were the *glory of the Churches of Christ*.

SECT. 7. You leave the Synod, to fowl your fingers a little about Doctor *Prideaux*, who was for many years the glory of the University of *Oxford*; but alas, his [*chair*] is only fit to make a *foot-stool* for your more incomparable Rabbiship. And to shew your self the far better Moderator, you slight [his arbitrating of the difference (as you phrasifie it) between the *Prophet of God*, and the *Synod of Dort*.] We know no difference between them that needs have a Dayes-man to umpire it; but yet take we notice of Dr. *Prideaux* his *distinction*, and your *opposition* which your subtilty makes against it.

There is (saith he) a double Righteousnes; one *Inherent* or of *works*, by which we are *Sanctified*; another *Imputed* or of *Faith*, whereby we are *Justified*. A Righteous man may turn aside from his own Righteousnes, *viz.* from his *Holiness*, and

and fall into very heinous sinnes; but it doth not follow from hence, that therefore he hath wholly *shaken off* from him, or *out of him the Righteousnes of Christ.*

Against this distinction of Dr. *P.* Mr. *Goodwin* hath no les then three unanswerable Exceptions. And

1. He tells us, [The Doctor presents us with a piece of new Divinity,] (the first time that ever I heard him taxed for innovation) [in making Sanctification and Justification no more intimate friends, then that one can live without the company and presence of the other.]

1. What is there in the Doctors words that sounds to this purpose? That [*Justification and Sanctification can live without enjoying the mutual company and presence one of another?*] *A Righteous man* (saith the Doctor) *may turne aside from his owne Righteousnes, and fall into very heinous sins.* Doth [a mans *turning aside from his own Righteousnes, and falling into very heinous sins,* infer, [*a los of the company and presence of his own Righteousnes?*] Do you go out of the company and presence] of your friends, every time you *turn aside from them?* or are you no longer in their [company and presence,] then you look full in their *faces.* Nothing hinders then, but a man may *turn aside from his own Righteousnes* in this or that case, and yet retain the *company of it* in your word. And if a man and his *own Righteousnes* may keep company in this case, then a *mans own Righteousnes,* notwithstanding the mans *turning aside from it,* and *Christs Righteousnes,* may keep company still together. At this time you have done little.

2. What if [Justification and Sanctification, can live one without the company and presence of the other,] are they therefore [no intimate friends?] no intimate friends can *live* belike without the *company and presence of one another;* then either Mr. *Goodwin* hath not so many [intimate friends,] as the world guessed, or Mr. *Goodwin* is never *alone in his Study* without their [company and presence.] Well, this is but a light straine of Mr. *Goodwins* Rhetorick, with which he thinks to make his Reader merry with our *Devonshire* Doctor. But this which followes carries doubtles much more weight in it.

[Doubtles, if a mans Justification can stay behind when his holines is departed, that assertion of the Apostle will hardly stand *Without Holines no man shall see the Lord.* And if they *that are Christs; i.e.* who believe in Christ, and are thereby justified, have *crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts* (another assertion of the same Apostle) how their relation unto Christ should stand, and yet their holines sink and fall (saith Mr. *Goodwin*) I understand not; but I leave the Doctors friends to be his enemies in this.]

Why, what is this, that must make the Doctors friends to become his enemies: I am not so devoted a friend to him, but that *magis amica Veritas;* but I see nothing in all this, that should make me abate ought of my opinion of his eminent Abilities, or of the Reverence which I justly owe to his memory.

1. The Doctor never said, [*That a mans Justification may stay behind, when his holines is departed;*] a man, I trow, may *turn aside from his Righteousnes,* yet not presently *depart from it;* as you may *turn aside from the Table,* yet not *go out of the Room.*

2. He never said, [*That a man that turnes aside from his righteousnes shall see the Lord;*] he shall not, notwithstanding his Justification, till he return with tears of Repentance. But

3. What if [*they who are Christs have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts,*] doth it follow their holines may not *sink* and *fall,* their relation to Christ *standing?* Doth your Holines never *sink?* Do you never *fall?* Do you lose your relation to Christ upon every *sinking* and *falling?* All *sinking* is not presently *sinking down dead;* and all *falling* is not presently *falling so as to rise no more.* They *who are Christs,* are preserved from *such sinkings and fallings,* not from *other.* Hitherto then [the Doctors peice of new Divinity,] is such as neither casts

blemish

blemish, nor makes rent in his old robes: but the *patch* that you have clapt on in the roome of it, is such, as he would nor deign to make use of, though he were never so much *out at elbowes*.

2. You charge our Doctor [as singular in another strain of Divinity;] of all other men, you should not lay that to his charge: And say, [He seems by his word *penitus*, to teach *magis* and *minus* in Justification; for in saying, that from a mans Apostatizing from his own Righteousnes, it doth not follow, that therefore he hath *wholly* or altogether shaken off the imputed Righteousnes of Christ; doth he not imply that a man may shake off some part of the Righteousnes of Christ from him, and yet keep another part of it upon him? or else that by sinning he may come to wear the intire Garment or Clothing of it so loosly that it will be ready to drop or fall off from him every hour; and consequently, that the Righteousnes of Christ sits faster and closer upon some, then upon others; yea, upon the same person at one time, then at another?]

What ever it be, you think you here sit so close upon our Doctors skirts, that it is not all his *shrugging* can shake you off. But though you conceive your Exception stick as fast as a *Tike*, it is easier to *brush it off*, then the *dust* from his Gown. Make the most you can of this *penitus*, he doth not imply, [That a man may shake off one part of Christs Righteousnes, and yet keep another on,] he divides not Christs Righteousnes after this fashion; nor yet doth he say, that [a man by sinning, may wear the Righteousnes of Christ so loosely, that it will be ready to drop or fall from him at any time:] he saith not, That [the Righteousnes of Christ sits faster and closer upon some, then others, and upon the same person at one time then another.] He sayes but this, *The same person may have more comfortable warmth by it at one time then another*; wrap himself more fully in it at *one time* then *another*. *Christs Righteousnes still covers all his sins from Gods eye*, so as he looks not upon him in *such anger*, as to sentence him to *hell*; *he doth not cover himself with it alike* at all times; and when ever a man sins, he seems to *ungird* himself; when he *repents*, to *draw all together again*. Though there be no *magis* and *minus* in Justification, in respect of Christs Righteousnes *imputed by God*, yet there may be acknowledged a *magis* and *minus* in it, in respect of *our apprehension of Christs Righteousnes imputed to us*, and the comfort we take in it; yea, and in regard of *Gods application of it to us* by *faith*, (which we are next to look upon as *his work*) there may be *magis* and *minus* too. Nor is Doctor *Prideaux*, in case hee said this *in terminis*, alone in this Assertion.

[3. And lastly (say you) Were it granted unto the Doctor, that from a mans turning from his own Holiness, it doth not follow, that therefore he hath wholly devested himself of the Righteousnes of Christ imputed; yet from Gods determination, or pronouncing a man to be in an estate of condemnation unto death, it followes roundly, that therefore he is devested of the Righteousnes of Christ imputed, if ever it were imputed to him before; (sure else he could not be devested of it) because no man with that Righteousnes upon him can be in such an estate.]

But where appears any such [determination of God?] We know no *new determinations of God*, but can demonstrate them to be all *Eternal*; and whom he *once determines to pardon*, he never after *determines to condemn*. The *Law* (it is true) pronounceth a man in this case *liable to death*; but the *Gospel*, notwithstanding this *liableness to death*, pronounceth him *pardonable upon Repentance*, and *his Advocate in Heaven* pleadeth for his pardon, and *lives for ever to make Intercession*, that he may not *dye without Repentance*. Nor have you hitherto proved, [That the Righteous man in this turning away from Righteousnes, is pronounced by God in the mouth of *Ezekiel*, a child of more then Temporal death.] This you confess [the Doctor denyes:] but as you jeer him [without giving a Reason,] and then crave leave to say, [That the Chair weighs not so much with you, as

one

one good Argument, much leſs as many.] That *Chair* of the Doctors, ſhall not be diſhonoured ſo much, as to be put in the ballance with your *Pulpit*. For your Reaſons, I have found them too *light* to bear any conſiderable proportion to *your own gravity*.

SECT. 8.

You tell how [ſome formerly in favor of the Doctrine of Perſeverance, attempted an eſcape from the ſword of *Ezekiel* drawn againſt it, by pretending, that by the *Righteous man* mentioned in the paſſages in hand, is not meant a perſon *truly* and *really Righteous*, but a kind of *formal Hypocrite*, or outſide Profeſſor of Righteouſneſs; but that the after Patrons of this Doctrine, and in particular the Synod of *Dort* it ſelf (as poor ſhifts as it otherwiſe made uſe of) bluſh'd to accept of any ſuch relief, and that Doctor *Prideaux* rewards the Synod with his approbation for refuſing to intruſt their Cauſe in the weak hand of ſo ſorry an Advocate as this; and therefore you need not make this ſtigmatized Interpretation, to paſs through the fire of a new tryal; yet you think to brand it anew, as utterly inconſiſtent with the whole ſeries of the Context, from *ver.* 20. to the end of the Chapter, which demonſtratively evinceth, that by the *Righteous man* all along, is meant ſuch a man as was, or is truly Righteous; and who, had he perſevered in that way of Righteouſneſs wherein he ſometimes walked, ſhould have worne the Crown of Righteouſneſs, and received the reward of a Righteous man, by the wicked man all along oppoſed to him, is meant not a man ſeemingly wicked, but truly and really ſo.]

But what if the *wicked man* be really ſuch, followes it, the *Righteous man*, to whom he is oppoſed is *really Righteous*? ſuch a wicked man may as well be oppoſed to a man righteous in the *judgment of men*, as to a man truly ſuch, and ſo *eſteemed by God*. An *Adulterer* may as well be oppoſed to a man who is *Chaſte*, upon conſideration of his *Civil Intereſt*, as to a man who is ſo out of *conſcience* of his *duty*. An *Oppreſſor* as well to a man who *forbears* ſuch unworthy practiſes upon principles of *Honour*, as to a man who *abhors* them upon principles of *Godlineſs*. An *Idolater* to a man who forbears to bow his knees to what was framed by anothers hand upon grounds of *Reaſon*; as to a man, who *deteſts* to do it upon grounds of *Religion*. An *open wicked man* is well enough oppoſed to a man *who is not openly wicked*, albeit in the *ſecrets* of his *heart*, there lodg *little Righteouſneſs*. This is the caſe here; the Prophet ſpeaks of a *wicked man* as *acting* all theſe abominations, of a *juſt* or *Righteous* man only, as *not acting* them for the *moſt part*: the Deſcription is but *Negative*, and when it is *Poſitive*, yet it is but of his *acts*, not his *intentions*; of the *matter*, not the *manner* of his works. Now an *unrighteous man* that *acts* ſuch wickedneſs, may well enough be oppoſed, 1. To a man who is only *ſo far righteous* as not to *allow himſelf* in ſuch *wicked acts*, and yet he may be *ſo far unrighteous* as to *abſtain* upon the account of his own *concernment*. 2. To a man who *acts contrary acts*, and yet he may act them upon none of the beſt principles, and his actions be for the *manner* abominable, when for the *matter* they are moſt *ſpecious* and *plauſible*. I ſee nothing in the Antitheſis that commands my aſſent to your confident Interpretation of [the *Righteous man*, by a man truly Righteous, becauſe the *wicked man* here ſpoken of is truly wicked.] What if the *Righteous man* in the ſenſe wherein we take him be truly *wicked*? One man that is *truly wicked* in *himſelf*, may be *rarely Righteous* compared to *another*, that is *profeſſedly and deſperately* wicked. Where doth the Text ſay, That [if this Righteous man here ſpoken of perſevere in his way of Righteouſneſs, he ſhould wear the Crown of Righteouſneſs.] True, he ſhould receive the *Reward of a righteous man*, as in this world, ſo did the *Phariſees*; What is that to the *world to come*? *He ſhall live*, ſaith the Text; that is, *not be cut off* by the *particular Judgment* threatned to the *Nation*: it ſaith not, *He ſhall live ſo*, as to inherit *life eternal among the Saints in Heaven*. I ſee nothing yet, why this Interpretation ſhould be thought the worſe for the beſt Reaſons you have produced againſt it. But what your own reaſon will not do,

Calvin

Calvin is preſt to make good by his venerable Authority, as who is required to ſay, [*That the righteous man here ſpoken of, is Righteous in ſuch a ſenſe, that nothing ſhould be wanting to him but Perſeverance in his way to make him bleſſed.*]

I cannot for my life find *your Engliſh* in *his Latine*, *Nunc autem terret eos, qui ad tempus profeſſi fuerant ſe puros & ſinceros eſſe Dei cultores, ſi deficiant in medio curſu.* What doth this ſound of *true Righteouſneſs* in the man ſtiled *Righteous* by the Prophet? Let [Perſeverance in a ſeeming holineſs] be as much as you will out of the way to any mans bleſſedneſs,] *Calvin* ſaith but

1. *That the Prophet terrifies thoſe that profeſs themſelves pure and ſincere Worſhippers of God, if they fail in the midſt of their courſe*; he doth not ſay, he *comforts them* if they perſiſt in a *bare profeſſion of the pure and ſincere Worſhip of God*; a *failing* in their *courſe of Profeſſion*, will aſſuredly render their condition the *more miſerable and curſed*, albeit a *perſevering* in their courſe will not make them *Happy* and *Bleſſed*. And

2. But this *Cæterum colligimus ex hoc loco, quemadmodum Chriſtus docet, ſolos beatos eſſe qui Perſeveraverint*; he ſaith not, *Omnes beatos eſſe qui Perſeveraverint* in *ſuch a profeſſion*. What if [*Nihil proderit temporalis juſtitia Apoſtatis, qui poſtea ſe à Deo avertunt*?] unleſs *propius ad Deum accedant* parum *proderit*, and yet the *Juſtitia temporalis* may be profitable to them as to *Temporal rewards*, and yet be of no uſe to them as to *Eternal*. And what if

3. [*Rurſum, ut in officio contineat eos, qui fecerunt aliquos progreſſus, & correctâ omni ignaviâ, eos ad ſolicitudinem adducat, minatur niſi ad extremum uſque proſequantur curſum ſancta & pia vita, Juſtitiam ſuperiorem pro nihilo fore?*] This ſhewes but that a *ceſſation* will loſe all the benefit of their former good behaviour; it ſhewes not that a *continuance* of it, will inſtate them in everlaſting happineſs. As for thoſe words which ſeem the moſt material, *Curſum ſancta & pia vitæ*, nothing hinders but that he ſpeaks of ſuch according to *mens* Judgment, not *Gods*; and you know who ſaid, *Væ vitæ laudabili*; as pious and holy as it may ſeem to *men*, it may carry another face in the eye of *God*. Thus *Calvin* ſpeaks not home to the point, nor doth Doctor *Prideaux*, whom you produce next, give in any more valuable evidence. [*If the righteous man ſhould turn himſelf from his counterfeit and hypocritical Righteouſneſs, ſhould he not rather live then dye, in as much as he ſhould put off the Wolf, to put on the Lamb?*]

1. You have made a pretty *Metamorphoſis*, in turning Doctor *Prideaux* his *Vulpem* into a *Wolf*; I pray let it be but a *Fox*, and poſſibly a *Fox* may ſeem to preach like a *Fryar*, but a *Wolf* never learnt, that I heard, to do more then put on the *Habit*. But

2. Why may not the *Wolf* be put off, yet no *Lamb* but a *Bear* put on? Why may not this *Righteous man* put off his *Hypocrical righteouſneſs* to put on an *hideous unrighteouſneſs*?

3. I am not ſworn to maintain the Doctor in *this*, albeit I ſhall ever humbly acknowledge, I owe very much to his Learned Readings, whence I had the happineſs to have the beſt inſtructions I ever received in the Doctrine which I here maintain.

SECT. 9. You tell us [how others have ſought for a door of eſcape from that Expoſition of the place in hand, which you have aſſerted, in the Hypothetical tenor and form of the words themſelves, *if*, or *when he ſhall turn away*; from whence nothing poſitive can be concluded; but that Doctor *Prideaux* hath done enough, though he have done leſs then the Remonſtrants,] and they a great deal leſs then Mr. *Goodwin* could do [for raſing this Sanctuary,] you content your ſelfe with [the Doctors ſaying, *That ſuch conditional Propoſitions, upon which Admonitions, Promiſes or Threatnings are built*, do at leaſt ſuppoſe ſomething in poſſibility, however by vertue of their tenor or form they ſuppoſe nothing in being:] and we acknowledg a *poſſibility* of the falling away of *any righteous man whatſoever*, yea, an *impoſſibility of his ſtanding* as of *himſelf*, which is ground enough for theſe *Admonitions*.

monitions. Only we deny, that this *poſſibility* ſhall ever be reduced into *act*, as being over-ruled by the *power and goodneſs of God.* There is not [the ſame caſe of the *Prophets threatning a righteous man with death, in caſe he fall away*; And the *Doctors promiſing a Scholer a Degree, in caſe he get all the Books in the Library at Oxford by heart.*] *This his Genius* renders utterly *impoſſible*, and ſo it is *vain to promiſe him a Degree* on *ſuch a condition*; *that* his genius is too *apparently inclined to*, and is only with-held from it by the over-ruling hand of *his gracious God*: and therefore *no vanity*, but *much uſe* in ſuch a threatning. So then, we yeild the Doctor *his poſſibility of the moſt righteous mans falling away*, elſe this Hypothetical propoſition, were a *weak ground*, for ſo *ſtrong an Exhortation.* The Doctor doth deny any *actual falling away of any righteous man*, and ſo acknowledgeth this hypothetical propoſition is *no ground* for a concluſion, that *any man* who was truly Righteous, either *did* or *ſhall* fall away. *He* and *I* are agreed upon the point, I doubt whether *You* and *I* ſhall, till we meet in Heaven; and there I doubt not, but we ſhall meet with *all thoſe men*, who were at *any time truly righteous*, and hear of *none* whoſe name was *ever written in the Book of Life*, that was *ever blotted out.*

You fall upon another Interpretation, given by ſome, of the Text; where they will have *Death* to ſignifie neither *Eternal* nor *Temporal death*, but only *afflictions*. I am content you ſhall have the honour to have conquered this Expoſition, and give you leave to make what Triumph you pleaſe for the Victory; yet if you carry your ſelf too loftily, I may hereafter chance to remember you of your *Mortality* in the midſt of your *ovation*, and mind you of your *horſe*, while you pride it in your *Chariot*, with a *quantum pulveris excitavimus?* SECT. 10

And truly, you enter upon the next Stage with *allaſtantara*, and ſpeak at ſuch a rare *Rodamantado*-like rate of Gloriation, as were enough to make me ſtand full forty foot off, but that I have had a competent experience of the charge which you are wont to beſtow on your words; and though by the *bore* of them, a man muſt acknowledge them to be *whole Cannons*, yet uſually they carry *no greater bullet* then ſuch as is wont to be found in a *Pot-gun*. And thus it is diſcharged as it were *Archipoëticè*. SECT. 11.

Nox erat & Cœlum factum ex Ciclope diurno
Nocturnus nunc Argus erat.——

[If we had meer ignorance or neſcience of the Truth to encounter or ſatisfie, though in conjunction with the greateſt parts of Judgment and Underſtanding on the one hand, and with the greateſt warineſs and ſcrupulouſneſs of circumſpection on the other hand, the traverſing of the Scripture already inſiſted upon, were ſufficient, I conceive, without any further labour of arguing to gain credit and fulneſs of conſent to that truth, which is now upon the advance. But prejudice and partiality, are Hydropical, and hardly ſatisfiable; and theſe are our chief Adverſaries in the buſineſs in hand.]

It ſeems you are ſufficiently confident what wonderful feats you can do upon ſuch ingenuous Adverſaries, as [meer ignorance and neſcience of the Truth,] and that you can abundantly ſatisfie their utmoſt curioſity, though never ſo ſtately attended with the greateſt parts of [Judgment and Underſtanding,] and a proportionable retinue of [warineſs & ſcrupulouſneſs of circumſpection.] It is the firſt time, that [meer ignorance and neſcience] marched in ſuch glory; and I believe ſhe is to ſeek how to compoſe her countenance to a due *decorum*, or how to hold up her head as becomes her, between theſe grand Supporters, [judgment, and underſtanding, and warineſs, and ſcrupulouſneſs of circumſpection:] When ſhee rides thus, no wonder if to ſhew her graciouſneſs, ſhe liberally throw away her [conſent] to any poor Arguments, that ſhall but pretend to her ſervice. But [prejudice

judice and partiality,] are more sullen; and these are the [Adversaries with which you are put to deal in the present Business;] these are [Hydropical,] and the *more Reasons* you powre upon them, the less they are *satisfied*. It is not certain though, whether the case be the *insatiableness of their appetite*, or the *unsatisfactorineſs of your Reasons*, which not being calculated to such a temper, as to give *content*, to save their *credit*, lay the blame on this unhealthy disposition of [prejudice and partiality] in the Readers. Well, to lose no more time in an impertinent correspondence with these your [Hydropical] expressions, let us with all Devotion attend what further [visions] you have to shew us of the same light] with the former, which looks as like *darkness*, as if it had been (as we plain fellowes say) *spit out of the mouth of it*. When we come to examine it, the next *Text* and the *Comment* upon it, gives no *new light*, but only such as we saw *vanishing Chap.* 4. where this Parable was shewed to be big with none of your Mysteries; and to keep up the credit of them, you here again shew us how [men may come sometimes under the Climate of Gods love, at other times of his hatred, he standing all as still the while,] as the Sun did, belike, in the day of *Joshuah*; and that our boggling at this notion ariseth meerly from [that capital error of a personal Election and Reprobation, of all which you have spoken *bis, ter*, already; and have been answered *terque quaterque*; nor have you [*spoken* it] oftner then it hath been *silenced* with a sufficient Reply, had it been capable of being rebuked into modesty.

Leaving this [vision] therefore for a *phantasme*, see we what we shall hear from [*Pauls keeping under his body*,] and how you will make it contribute to the lifting up of the head of your present design.

SECT. 14. 1 Cor. 9. 27. From those words, 1 *Cor.* 9. 27. *But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest by any means when I have preached unto others, I my selfe should be a cast away.* You argue thus, [If *Paul* after his Conversion, were in a possibility of falling away, then so are true Believers now; but *Paul* was; *ergo.*]

You need not put your self to the trouble of any further fortifying the several parts of your Argument; take *all the Conclusion*; we have all along granted such a *possibility of Believers falling totally and finally*, as is sufficient to be a ground of *solicitousness for their standing*; *viz. a possibility of falling* in respect of *themselves*; the *impossibility of their non falling away* in respect of *Gods gracious protection* stands well enough amidst this *possibility of falling*. They are *apt to fall*; yea, *unable to keep themselves from falling*; no *possibility* of standing upon *their own feet*, yet may they well enough be *secured by Gods hand*.

SECT. 15. You take notice of another sense of ἄπειρος. *untried* or *unexperienced*, and endeavor to refute it. I shall only need to refer my Reader to what hath been said of this Text, in my Answer to *Sect.* 22. of your *Chap.* 4. where I gave the full scope of this place, and yet for the present I will admit your sense, and so let you take *all*, that *there is a possibility* (such as I granted before) *of the Saints falling away*, and that so much shall appear *hence*; but if hence you conclude a possibility of their being *Reprobated*, you *conclude* somewhat that proves a *falling away of God from his constancy to his Decrees*; that having *Elected Believers*, he should afterwards *Reprobate them*. And so this Text would *do too much*, if this were the meaning of ἄπειρος; and therefore this is *not the meaning*, and so it doth *nothing* of your business.

SECT. 16. You have a fling at [*Parens*, reasoning out of this very place, that there was no danger or possibility of *Pauls* becoming a Reprobate. *As is followeth not*, (saith he) *Christ dyed lest Believers should perish, therefore Believers are in danger of perishing; but on the contrary, that Believers are out of the danger of perishing because Christ dyed for them; so it doth not follow, I keep under my body lest I should be a Reprobate, therefore I am in danger of being a Reprobate; but on the con-*

trary

trary, therefore there is no danger of my being a Reprobate, becauſe I keep my body under.

To this you anſwer, [1 by conceſſion of all *Paræus* hath ſaid, if his meaning be, that *Paul* was in no danger of being a Reprobate, *whiles he kept under his body*. But 2. by Exception, ſaying, If he intend to aſſert, either that *Paul, whiles he did keep under his body, was in no poſſibility of giving over that exerciſe; or that giving over that exerciſe, hee was in no poſſibility of being a Reprobate*; the Argument reacheth neither, unleſſe it be in a way of *confutation*. For, as there was a precedaneous poſſibility, that Chriſt *who did die, might not have died*; and *in caſe hee had not died, that the perſons who now beleeve in him ſhould not have been ſaved: ſo was there a poſſibility both that* Paul *might not have kept under his body, or not continued to keep it under, and ſo not have been ſaved.*]

I yeild all; a *poſſibility* of *Pauls not being ſaved*, without the uſe of the *means*; yea, *no poſſibility* of his uſe of the means, without Gods *grace*; but having given him *grace*, there was an *impoſſibility* of either; as Chriſt *having died*, an *impoſſibility* of the *non-ſaving of Beleevers*: and ſo from his uſing of the *means* leſt hee ſhould *not be ſaved*, is clearly inferred, Gods *intention*, and conſequently a *certainty of Pauls ſalvation*.

What you ſay of *Chryſoſtome, Paræus, Calvin, Muſculus, Deodate*, is not conſiderable: you prove from all of them no more then *I grant*, a *poſſibility* of the *falling* away of beleevers as to *themſelves*; yea, let it be an *impoſſibility* of their *ſtanding* in their *own ſtrength*; And this is enough to put them upon *beating down their bodies*, the *ſtrength* of their *fleſh*, being the greateſt cauſe of their *weakneſſe*.

But when you come to conſider the ſcope of the place more narrowly from verſe 23. you do as little; The [Apoſtle (ſay you) having aſſerted this for the Reaſon, motive, or end why *he had made himſelf a ſervant to all*, that he might be *partaker of the Goſpel*; viz. of the ſaving benefit or bleſſing of it *with them*, ver. 23. And again, that what he did was to *obtain an incorruptible Crown*, ver. 25. plainly ſheweth, that that which he ſought to prevent by *running*, and *fighting* at ſuch a rate as he did, was not the blame or diſparagement of ſome ſuch misbehaviour, under which notwithſtanding he might retain the ſaving love of God; but the loſſe of his part and portion in the Goſpel, and of that *incorruptible Crown*, which he ſought by that ſevere hand over himſelf, to obtain.]

I anſwer 1. That his being *partaker of the Goſpel*, relates as well to the *comforts* of it for the *preſent*, as the *glory in heaven* promiſed in it for the *future*. Now the *riſing* of his *fleſh* would have been the *fall* of his *ſpirit*; nor could he have enjoyed the *joy of the holy Ghoſt*, had he left himſelf to be too much taken with the *pleaſures of the fleſh*. The more he had indulged to *himſelf*, the leſſe *aſſurance* had he had of the *favour of God* to him.

2 That his aim at an *uncorruptible Crown*, ſhews not that he *beat down his body*, only out of fear of loſing *it*; but out of fear of loſing the *honour of ſeeking it*; and that he ſhould otherwiſe ſeem to *come ſhort of it*, Heb. 4. 1. Yea, it was the confidence of *obtaining that crown*, that put him on this *beating down of his body*, for which he knew that would make him a moſt abundant amends.

Yet ſhall not I trouble my ſelf about *Paræus* his Collection, of the *certainty* of *Pauls ſalvation* from *theſe words*; it is enough, that *yours* of the *uncertainty* of it, is broken. We do not attempt to eſtabliſh the Doctrine of Perſeverance by *this* Text; it is as much as we have to do, to ſhew, *you* do not *overthrow* it by this Text.

Our Engliſh Annotations upon the place, have juſt cauſe for their being tender of admitting any ſuch ſenſe of the word ἀδόκιμος, which ſhould imply any *uncertainty* in the Apoſtle of his *Election*, or of obtaining the *prize*; though you (by your prettie Parentheſis neer the foot of your former Section) ſeem not to be ſo ſure of the Apoſtles *ſalvation*: What elſe means that *diminiſhing addition?* SECT. 17

[though now, as you have cauſe in abundance to judg concerning him, he be ſaved.] This [cauſe in abundance] is a very *deficient expreſſion*, and you had ſaid *much more*, had you ſaid leſſe, *though now he be ſaved*. It ſeems, you have but [abundant cauſe] to judg; you are not *altogether aſſured* that he is *ſaved*. Well, yet the Engliſh Annotations are jealous of conſtruing δόκιμος ſo as to imply the leaſt uncertainty in him, that he ſhould be ſaved; and you bear us in hand too, that [your ſenſe of the word doth not imply any uncertainty in the Apoſtle, either of his Election, or of obtaining the prize, if by uncertainty be meant any thing grievous and diſcouraging to him. For, ſay you,

[1. He might notwithſtanding any poſſibility of becoming a Reprobate afterwards, know certainly for the preſent, he was elected, becauſe hee knew hee beleeved.]

I told you before, that you make Gods *Election* to be in danger of *falling*, as well as *Pauls Faith*; he might be elected *one day*, yet Reprobate *another*: And this is the choice Divinity you have frequently vented in other places of this your learned Diſcourſement. But to ſay nothing of the diſhonour caſt upon God by this *variable Election*, which your Metaphyſical Doctorſhip is pleaſed to put upon him; what comfort could *Paul* take in ſuch an *Election*, which was but with a *quamdiu bene ſe geſſerit*, and left it to himſelf to *reprobate himſelf* at any time, by allowing too much to that *fleſh* of his, of whoſe ſtrength he had *frequent experience*, and made many ſad complaints?

Why, but ſay you, 2. [Notwithſtanding ſuch a poſſibility of becoming a Reprobate, hee might have as much certaintie of obtaining the *prize*, as was any waies meet or reaſonable for him either to deſire or enjoy: this certaintie he had upon his continuance in well doing: and for a man to be certain of obtaining the prize, though he ſhould apoſtatize into waies of wickedneſſe, is not a certaintie either meet for God to give, or for any man to receive.]

True: but is a certaintie that man ſhould *not apoſtatize*, of ſuch calculation, tendencie and import? This is that we contend for, and humbly conceive it neither *diſhonourable* for God to *decree*, nor *uncomfortable* for man to *receive*. Take away this, and how little comfort had S. *Paul*? What albeit he ſhould not be a Reprobate [whiles he continued in weldoing?] how apt was he to *diſcontinue* it? What a *wretched man* did he hold himſelf by reaſon of his *body of death*? How did he bemoan himſelf for the *law in his members*? How many incurſions of temptations did he every day meet with, enough to appall his comfort, if it be ſuſpended meerly upon the *continuance of his well-doing*, that ſo long he ſhall *continue elect*? and not rather upon his *election*, and therefore hee ſhall for ever be kept *continuing in wel-doing*; at leaſt, *preſerved from every evil work*, unto an *heavenly kingdom*. You (perhaps) would have told him here, as you do the Reader, Chapt. 9. that [the Doctrine of Apoſtaſie is much more comfortable then that of Perſeverance,] and bid him be the more couragious, for that he was in *danger to be overthrown*; and the more ſweetly *enjoy himſelf*, becauſe hee was every moment likely to *loſe himſelf*; and *walk the leſſe heavily*, becauſe hee was in peril of *ſlipping every foot*; and *ſtand* the more *confidently*, becauſe he was upon the very *brink of confuſion*, and in poſſibilitie of falling every time he ſtept aſide. You would have told him, it was ſome *diſhonour* to him to be too much *ſecured* by an unchangeable Decree of heaven; and ſome diſparagement, to be held too faſt like a child, by his Father in heaven. It is a priviledg to be ſet at libertie, and left to the ſole guidance of his own diſcretion. It will be more glory to him, to come to heaven by *leſſe grace*; and it may be a comfort to him, that when he comes thither, he ſhall not owe it *all* to the *meer pleaſure* of God; but that he being left by him indifferent, to ſtand or fall, ſtood on his *own bottom*; and that it is more for his renown to *ſtand a while* in his *own ſtrength*, then to *ſtand for ever* in *Gods*.

SECT. 18. You inſiſt upon *Heb.* 6. 4,5,6,7. &c, to evince the poſſibilitie of a *finall* defection

ction in the Saints, *For it is impoſſible for thoſe who were once enlightned, and have taſted of the Heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghoſt, and have taſted the good Word of God, and the powers of the world to come; if they ſhall fall away, to renew them again by Repentance, ſeeing they crucifie to themſelves the Son of God afreſh, and put him to an open ſhame. For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dreſſed, receiveth bleſſing from God; but that which beareth thornes is nigh unto curſing, whoſe end is to be burned.* Anſwerable hereunto (ſay you) is that *Heb.* 10.26,27. *For if we ſin wilfully after we have received the knowledg of the Truth, there remaineth no more Sacrifice for ſins, but a certain looking for of Judgment and fiery indignation, which ſhall devour the Adverſaries. He that deſpiſed Moſes his Law, died without mercy under two or three witneſſes; of how much ſorer puniſhment, ſuppoſe ye, ſhall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the bloud of the Covenant wherewith he was ſanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done deſpight to the Spirit of Grace?* Before the face of theſe paſſages, rightly underſtood, and duly conſidered, there is (you ſhould have crowed) no poſſibility of ſtanding for that Doctrine which denies a poſſibility of the Saints falling totally and finally; yet that two Exceptions are wont to be made againſt it, you acknowledge,

[1. *That the Apoſtle ſpeaks onely conditionally, aſſerts nothing poſitively of it.* But to this you reply,

[1. In General, That you have non-ſuited it already in *Chap.* 12 *Sect.* 9.] Let the Reader be Judge, and whether I have not wiped off the blot, which you would fain caſt upon it [from the pen of this Learning,] you mean Dr. *Prideaux*; as much as you make of your choice Anſwer, it is not worth the confuting a ſecond time. We acknowledg a *poſſibility of the Saints falling*, yea, *totally* and *finally* on *one* ſide; *viz. their own*; we deny it on the *other* ſide, *viz. Gods*; the firſt is enough whereon to lay the foundation of *Admonitions* and *Threatnings*.

[2. In Particular, you deny, that there is any hypothetical ſign or conditional Particle to be found in either of theſe Texts in the Original; and ſay, thoſe two *ifs* are evidences of leſs faithfulneſs in our Tranſlators then became them, but it was their inclination to the Doctrine of Perſeverance that corrupted them more then once in this kind.]

I anſwer, 1. It is no diſhonour to this Doctrine, that our Tranſlators (great Scholers, and no Perkiniſts) were ſo paſſionately devoted to it, as to adventure [to wrong the Text a little too much in its behalfe, and hazard the reputation of their own skill and integrity] to preſerve the *honour* of this *Aſſertion*. But

2. I do not find that any other Tranſlators read it otherwiſe, the *Syriack* only excepted.

3. I ſee no difference between your [when,] and our Tranſlators *if*, both are ſuch Particles, as I take it, as ſerve for the ſign of an *Hypothetical Propoſition*. Oh the rare correction of our accurate Reformer, of the inconſiderate, or unfaithful rabble of former Tranſlators, who ſo exactly renders the Original, as not to put *if* in ſtead of *when!* But

4. What if neither your [when] be in the Original, as indeed it is not? now why may not their *if* be allowed, as well as your [when.] Call a Jury of Uſhers to give their Verdict in the caſe depending between the general [rut] of Tranſlators, as your word is, and the moſt Reverend Father in God, the L. Primate of *Caleman-ſtreet*.

[The ſecond Exception which pretends to find only Hypocrites and not true Believers ſtaged in both paſſages, you have at a greater advantage, and undertake to ſhew that theſe Texts repreſent true Believers in their fulleſt glory; witneſs no leſs then ſeven Characters of Saints in the higheſt elevation, and four other Reaſons;] of all which in their order. SECT. 19.

[1. Say

[1. Say you, The persons here spoken of, are said to be φωτισθέντες, *enlightned*, meaning with the knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ in the Gospel. How frequently is this attributed to the Saints or true Believers? 2 *Cor.* 4.4,6. *Hebr.* 10.3.]

Be it so. This will not hold out for an Argument though: I pray observe, *All true Believers are enlightned*; ergo *All that are enlightned are true Believers*. *All Common Councel men of London are Freemen*; ergo, *All Freemen are Common Councel men*. *All the Elders of the Churches at London are Church Members*; ergo, *All the Church Members are Elders*. *Every one of Mr. Goodwins Books is full of much new light*; ergo, *Every Book that is full of much new light is Mr. Goodwins*, and he is the Author of all the choice Pieces that have been published since our late glorious Reformation. This is just Mr. *Goodwins* Logick, [*The Grace of Illumination is frequently attributed to the Saints or true Believers*; ergo, *All to whom the Grace of Illumination is attributed are true Believers.*] Yea, but [this Illumination is so appropriate unto the Saints or found Believers, that our Saviour himself stiles the generation of them υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτὸς, and *Paul* admonisheth the Ephesians to *walk* (ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς) *as Children of the light*; and he distinguisheth their present estate in Faith, from their former in unbelief, thus, *For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord.*

I answer, There is a great difference between φωτισθέντες and υἱοὶ φωτὸς. All that are *inlightned* are *not children of the light*; some of them may be *Rebels against the light*, as in *Job* 24.13. As great a difference between φωτισθέντες and such as *walk as children of the light*; Many may chuse to *walk in the dark*, though with a *light in their hands*; as when men *shut a dark lanthorn*. No less between φωτισθέντες, and *the light*: All that are *inlightned*, are not presently made *the light*; shortly, an *illumination* doth not infer a *Conversion*, though it be true, there be no *Conversion* without *Illumination*.

SECT. 20. [2. You tell us, the persons here spoken of, are said to have received, ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, *the acknowledgment of the Truth*, which signifies such a consenting and subjection hereunto, as separateth men from sin and sinners.]

Be it so; But all men that are separated from *some sin* and *sinners*, are not presently *true Saints*. See (if you please) what I have shewed to this purpose in Answer to your *Sect.* 28, *&c.* of your *Chap.* 8. *Every acknowledgment of the Truth*, to a *declining wayes of grosser wickedness*, is not an evidence of *Saving Faith*; their very *declining* of *grosser wickedness*, may occasion their *depending on their owne Righteousness*, and keep them from *submitting unto the Righteousnesse of God.*

SECT. 21. [3. The persons queried about, are said to be Sanctified *with*, or *by the bloud of the Covenant.*] But *Sanctification* bears more senses then one, and doth not alwayes reach an *inward* and *real Sanctification*. See to this purpose my Answer to *Chap.* 8. *Sect.* 50, 51. You proceed.

SECT. 22. [4. Nay, but they are said to *taste*, or to *have tasted* of the *Heavenly gift*. Whete 1. By the *Heavenly Gift*, may be meant either *Christ* himself, called the *Gift of God*, *John* 4.10. or the *Holy Ghost*, said to be *given to them that believe*, *Acts* 11.17. and 5.32. or the *Gift of Righteousness*, *Rom.* 5.15, 16, 17. or *Salvation*, or *Eternal life*: this is the *Gift of God*, *Rom.* 6.23. Now all these are given only to true Believers.]

But I think, the *Heavenly Gift* will include many other things common to *Believers* and *unbelievers*. Πᾶν ἀγαθὸν δῶρον, every *Earthly Blessing* is a *Heavenly Gift*; *comes* from *thence*, and should *lead thither*. But grant, it here signifie [*Christ himself*, the *Holy Ghost*, the *Gift of Righteousness*, *Eternal life*, all;] it followes not, that they who *taste* them must presently *enjoy* them; they may *taste all these*, and yet *spit* them out again, *taste* and *detest* them. Yea, but

[2. Say you, This taste signifies an emphatical, inward, and affectuous relish and

and ſenſe of the excellent ſweetneſs and pleaſantneſs of this gift, oppoſed to a bare ſpeculation.] It may ſignifie much *above* [*bare ſpeculation,*] yet not a little leſſe then a *bleſſed experience*. Let the words be [ſpoken to aggravate their ſin of Apoſtaſie,] they might have ſo *much experience* of the ſweetneſs of this gift, as to [*aggravate* their ſin,] yet not enough to *ſave their ſouls*. It was an [aggravation of their ſin] that they ſlighted ſo much knowledge. We may not underſtand this *taſting* in a *Diminutive* ſenſe, and yet we cannot underſtand it in an [emphatical] one; they might *taſte* and *take* a conſiderable quantity of this *Heavenly gift*; yea, and *ſwallow it down*; yet *vomit it up* again; the fault here might be a diſtemper, not in their *palates*, but their *ſtomacks*. What if [*David* invite to *taſte and ſee that the Lord is good*?] That is, to make leſs of *taſting* then *ſeeing*; for he puts that *before* this; and if it were more, his ſentence ſhould *riſe* by *falling*. What if [the King, that made the Invitation ſaid, none of thoſe that were bidden ſhould *taſte of his Supper*;] the leſs is ſignified by *taſting*, the more is the *ſeverity* of his *threat*. And laſtly, What if [*Peter* ſay to his Chriſtian *Jewes, If ſo be ye have taſted that the Lord is gracious*?] He ſhewes, that any *little taſte* ſhould move them to a *great longing*, not that it was of it ſelfe ſufficient to make them *grow*. [*Act.*10.10] hath not a word of *taſting*, it ſpeaks only of *Peters* being *hungry* and *deſire to eat*. [*Mark* 9.1, and *Hebr.*2.9.] of *taſting death*, which is far enough from *taſting the Heavenly Gift*, and is as *bitter* to the taſting, as this is *ſweet*, and as far diſtant from the buſineſs in hand. In concluſion, you are content to acknowledg, That [the word γεύεσθαι, ſignifies ſometimes only a ſlender perception, but that this is only when the reliſh, or taſt of a thing is deſired to be known, as *John* 2.9. *when the Ruler of the feaſt had taſted of the water which was made wine.*] How can you tel, he but put the *cup to his mouth* and took it off *without drinking a ful draught*? but *Matth.*27.34. *Chriſt taſted the vinegar, and would not drink*; and ſo might theſe men only faſt the Heavenly gift, and put it by: and it might be but their curioſity to taſte, that ſatisfied, they might loath it.

But [laſtly (ſay you) if this *taſte* imply no more but only a faint and weak perception of the *Heavenly gift*, yet even this may, according to the ſenſe of your Adverſaries in the preſent debate, be ſufficient to evince truth of Grace and Faith: for their opinion is, that a man may be a *true Believer*, with a *grain of Muſtard ſeed only*; *i. e.* with a very ſlender taſte of Spiritual things; yea, in ſome caſe with little or no taſte of them at all.]

Right, A man may be a *Believer with a little taſte*; and yet may he be an *unbeliever* with a *greater*; a *ſmaller apprehenſion* ſeconded with a due *appreciation* and *appetite*, may demonſtrate faith; a *greater without it, infidelity*. I *taſte* no more in all this, then in the *white of an egg*; nor have you yet ſaid any thing that makes me favor any true Saintſhip in theſe perſons.

But 5. To make your Concluſion the more authentick, you would have us conſider further, [That theſe perſons are repreſented, as having ſometimes worn the Crown of Saintſhip, *They were made partakers of the Holy Ghoſt*; this ſignifies no leſs then a partaking of *his Regenerating vertue and power*.] Yes, it will ſuffice to ſay, That *every Illumination and Reformation upon it*, entitles to a *partaking of the Holy Ghoſt*; yet many have had extraordinary gifts (of which you here ſpeak) who yet never partook in the *more common*, but withal *more precious gifts of Regeneration*. It is not true, That [partaking of the Holy Ghoſt is in Scripture dialect appropriated only to true Believers.] By your leave, communion with Chriſt, or the communion of the Holy Ghoſt, are different from *partaking of the Holy Ghoſt*. Any *inferior gifts* of the *Holy Ghoſt* may entitle a man to *this*, none but the *ſpecial Graces* and *Comforts of the Holy Ghoſt* entitle him to *that*. SECT. 23 SECT. 24.

6. Say you, [Theſe perſons are further ſaid to have *taſted*, according the import of the word lately opened, of the *good word of God*, *i.e.* the great beneficialneſs SECT. 25.

of

of the Word of God, or of the Goſpel unto them, as being able to *build them up, and give them an Inheritance among them that are ſanctified.*]

I find no ſuch word upon the place, and yet they might *taſte much goodneſs in the Word*, yet not be *made good by the Word*; *taſte the goodneſs of God*, yet *continue* in their *own wickedneſs*. Do you think as you ſay, That [none but good men can taſte goodneſs in the Word of God?] The *Promiſes* go down ſweetly with many *evil men*; *good men* find the *Precepts ſweet*, and they reliſh ſome ſecret *ſweetneſs* in the very *threats*, and the *ſeverity* of God againſt *impenitent men*, is *ſweet to them*; it is *ſweet* to them to reflect upon the *bitter* viols from which they have the happineſs to be delivered; every clauſe *ſweeter* then *the honey and the honey comb*: Hypocrites are far from taſting ſuch an *univerſal ſweetneſs* in the *Word*.

But ſay you, [Whereas taſting is not without touching, nor touching without application of the object, it appears that thoſe who taſte the good Word of God muſt needs make application of the goodneſs of it to themſelves, and their own ſouls; which our Adverſaries frequently make a diſtinguiſhing character between Hypocrites and true Believers.] I yeild a particular application of *ſome Truths*, but even that particular application is not of *all Truths*; ſome they *nauſeat* and *loath*, and even *every Truth* that *thwarteth* and croſſeth their *corrupt humours*.

SECT. 26. 7. [And laſtly, (ſay you) Theſe perſons are further ſaid to have *taſted* (δυνάμεις μέλλοντος & αἰῶνος) *the powers of the world to come*; that is in general ſomewhat tranſcendantly excellent and glorious, whether in the Joyes of Heaven, as ſome; or the Incarnation, Humiliation, Sufferings, Death, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, &c. of the Son of God, as other; and a taſte, that is, a real and inward feeling of their vertue, influence, and vigor upon the heart and ſoul, fully evinceth a man to be a Member of the Congregation of the *firſt born*, and to have Spiritual communion by faith with Jeſus Chriſt.]

Let a *taſte* ſignifie [a real and inward feeling of their influence, vigor and vertue upon the heart;] it ſignifies not a [feeling of their influence, vigor, and vertue,] to a change of the heart, ſo as to devote it ſelf, out of love, to Chriſt; and ſo long, is far from fully evincing a man to have *communion by faith with Jeſus Chriſt*. A *taſte* of the *bitterneſs of ſin*, a *loathing* of the *pollution* of it, is neceſſarily required to this *change*; and whether theſe men had any *ſuch taſte* of their *liableneſſe to Gods wrath*, of the *vileneſſe of their ſins*, which rendred them liable to it, *non conſtat*.

SECT. 28. But you ſubjoyn four ſeveral Reaſons pregnant of proof, that theſe perſons were no Hypocrites, but true Believers.

[1. There is (ſay you) no clauſe, phraſe, or word in either of the places any wayes characteriſtical or diſcretive of Hypocriſie or Hypocrites; there are none of thoſe colours to be ſeen, which are wont to be uſed in drawing or limning the Portraitures or ſhapes of theſe Beaſts, as diſtinguiſhed from Creatures of a better kind; all the lineaments preſented in theſe Tables, become the beſt and faireſt faces of the Saints, and are not to be found in any other; yea, the greateſt and moſt intelligent Believer under Heaven hath no reaſon but to deſire part and fellowſhip with the Hypocrites here deſcribed, in all theſe Characters and Properties which are attributed unto them before their falling away.]

Nor had the Apoſtle reaſon to mention any but their *beſt*, to make the worſt of their fall; What aggravation was it for a *rotten* heart to *fall* off? What for a *hollow* heart to *fail*? What for men to grow from *bad* to *worſe*? But for them to fall from *good* to *bad*, from an *affectation* of being *excellent in goodneſs*, to be *eminent in wickedneſs*, was to be ſo much *worſe*, as they before ſeem'd better then others. The [Lineaments preſented upon theſe Tables] become (I yeild) the [faireſt face of the Saints;] nor do we deny, theſe had the *faces of Saints*; the queſtion

queſtion is, What *hearts* they had? But that *none but Saints* had ſuch *faces* as *theſe men*, or that *theſe men* had the *hearts* of Saints, your Reaſons, as [pregnant] as they are, have not hitherto proved. The [*beſt Believers* may well *deſire* partnerſhip with the Hypocrites here deſcribed, in all thoſe properties mentioned;] they are *all good*, ſo is the *guilding* on a *painted Sepulcher*; Doth *that* prove thoſe men Saints? We may all [deſire *partnerſhip*,] with *Heathen men* in *Moral Vertues*; the fault was not, that they *had not ſomewhat that was good*, but that they *had not enough of that good* to render it *ſaving* to them.

[But (ſay you) true believers are in a ſtate of honour, and are lifted up to heaven; in which reſpect they have from whence to fal: but hypocrites are as neere hel alreadie, as lightly they can be, til they be actually fallen into it.] By your leave, *then* they wil not be [neer it.] From whence then are they capable of falling?

I anſwer, though they be indeed *neer hel*, yet they ſeem as *neer heaven*, and may fall from ſeeming what they *were not*, to *ſeeming what they were*; from a *profeſſion of piety*, to a *profeſſion of impiety*. Men really of *no eſtates*, yet may carrie the Reputation of *great eſtates*, and live for a while *ſplendidly* on that reputation, getting into their hands *other mens money*; at laſt *loſe that reputation*, and *ſhew themſelves* to have been *beggers*, and *make* many *others* ſuch alſo. Hypocrites may *fall away* from that *good* which their Hypocriſie *pretended* to: this is far from being [rather a riſing then a fall:] Is it a [riſing] with you, to become of a *temperate* man in *Diet* and *Language*, a *prodigious powrer in* of all Exceſs, and *powrer out* of Exorbitant ſpeeches? A *Beggar* may be ſaid to *break*, when he is faine to *ſhut up his Shop*, albeit before he *had nothing in it*, but what was taken up *upon credit*, and *not paid for*.

[3. You add, It is no puniſhment to Hypocrites to be under no poſſibility of being renewed againe by Repentance; nay, in caſe they ſhould fall away, it would be a benefit to them to be under an impoſſibility of being renewed againe, for if this were their caſe, it would be impoſſible for them ever to be Hypocrites again.]

Yes, this is of all other the ſaddeſt thing, that *ſuch men ſhall never recover* as much as a *form* of Godlineſs, but be left for ever to all extremity of *profane oppoſition of it*, that *they ſhall never again be renewed* to as much as *an outſide of holineſſe*, not to that *ſlight tincture* which is found even among Hypocrites; and though this be a *ſorry preferment*, yet is it a *heavy judgment* not to *riſe again as high as this*.

[4. And laſtly, It ſtands (ſay you) forty foot off at leaſt from all probability, that the Apoſtle writing onely to theſe whom he judged true and ſound Believers, as appears *Chapt.* 3.14. 6.9. ſhould ſo ſeriouſly admoniſh them of ſuch evils, which only concerned other men, and whereunto themſelves were not at all obnoxious; and had they been, all Cautions and Admonitions would not, according to their principles, with whom we have now to do, have relieved or delivered them.]

I anſwer, 1. It doth not appear out of theſe places, that the Apoſtle judged all thoſe to whom he wrote to be *true Believers*. *Ye are partakers of Chriſt, if ye continue*, in the firſt Text; *I am perſwaded better things of you*, in the laſt, refer at moſt, but to the *moſt*, not *all*. Did not Chriſt ſpeak thus to his Diſciples, among whom there was yet *one* who was a *Divel*? Did not the Apoſtle write to the Church at *Corinth*, as *true Believers*, in whom there were yet *many Hypocrites*; ſo he did here to his Hebrewes.

2. It is falſe, that [true Believers are no way benefited by ſuch Cautions;] theſe are Soveraign Remedies *againſt Apoſtaſie*. *We* ſay, *true Believers* are as to *themſelves*, in danger of *apoſtatizing*, and ſo have *uſe*, yea, *need* of ſuch *Cautions*.

[Waſhing is indeed no means to keep ſnow white;] that will make it ceaſe

to be *snow*, but *wiping* may be a good means to keep [*snow white*,] and the white *snow* may have such *dust* and *filth* fall upon it, as that it may need, not only *wiping*, but *scraping*; and besides it may need *covering* to keep off such *dust*. [To rear up a pillar in the Air,] is a pretty [ridiculous means to keep the Heavens from falling;] but you build a *Castle in the air*, in saying, [we rear a pillar to keep up the Heavens;] you in vain attempt from all your *Castles* in the *air*, to beat downe the *Stars from Heaven*. Your two next Sections are but a Repetition of what you have essayed, not effected here upon this place.

SECT. 31. Heb. 10. 38. You produce *Hebr.* 10. 38. *Now the just shall live by Faith; but if any man draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in him.* And tell us, 1. That our Translators out of good will to a bad Cause, have almost defaced this Testimony, reading *any man* in steed of *he*, the *just man*. 2. That *Beza* stained the honour of his faithfulness with the same blot.]

1. I see no reason why you should thus unworthily slur these most Reverend Divines. I yeild, *any man* is not in the Text, but the *just man* who shall *live by his faith* doth not *draw back*; and therefore *he that draweth back* must be *any man* rather then *he*; and that the Apostle speaks of a *man actually drawen back*, and therefore not of the *just man*, is probable, by his next words, *My soul*, ἐν οὐδενὶ, in the Present Tense; as who should say, *I have no pleasure in those that draw back*, let *them draw back still*, but *the just shall live*; *the Righteous shall be righteous still*. You are fain to put a Comment, [*The just shall live by his faith, if he shall continue*,] that you may make the following clause to cohere with the former: this *if he shall continue*, is as much beside the word of the Text, as our Translators and *Beza's*, *any man*.

2. What if this be to be read *impersonally*, as it seems the Syriack Paraphrast took it? and then it may very well refer to *all men* that draw back; and the ἐν τῷ may better be read *in it*; My soul takes no pleasure *in it*; *viz. drawing back* that is, *abhors* it, as you interpret it not amiss, And the ὑποστολῆς in the next verse seems to suggest so much.

3. If you shall say, *No man can draw back but he who was Just*, and should have *lived, had he continued so*: I answer, That word ὑποστολῆς, signifies not so much a *drawing back*, as a *betaking to a place* where a man fancieth great security, albeit he leave not a place of any strength to go thither.

4. I observe, that there is no need of making the δὲ in the latter clause to be *adversative* or *discretive*, as equivalent to ἀλλὰ, but that more genuinely it would be rendred as a *Copulative*, *And if there be drawing to another Defence, my soul shall have no pleasure.* So that these words do not necessarily carry in them ought that infers as much as a *possibility of the falling back of a Believer*, and *his danger upon his falling back*, but only the displeasure of God against *drawing back* absolutely considered, or rather *drawing under*, ὑποστολὴ, to a place, as may be apprehended, of more *security*: *Subductio*, wherein there seems to be an opposition of the *sculking* and *hiding of infidelity*, to the *openness* and *boldness* of appearing which is in *Faith*.

And thus this Text which you pretend to be *like a King, against whom there is no rising up*, leaveth you *lying all along* at his *foot stool*, without holding out his *Scepter*, yea, or his *hand* or *foot* to you to kiss. We need not insist upon the *conditional form of the sentence*, and yet [that forlorn,] as you call it, is not routed by you, as you boast. Let the Reader please to review what hath been said on both sides, as to that particular. And whereas you jest it out here, [That if *the just man who shall live by his faith*, be in no possibility of *drawing back*, God must be conceived to speak at no better rate then this, *If the just shall do that which is simply and utterly impossible for him to do, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.*] I have often told you, *We* acknowledg a *possibility of the just mans falling*, as to *himself*; yea, and an *impossibility* of his *standing*; and therefore upon *our* grounds God speaks not thus, *If the just shall do what is simply and utterly impossible*

sible for him to do, but if he *shall not be kept by me from doing that*, *which it is impossible for himself, left to himself, not to do, I will*, or *I have no pleasure in him*. So that this may rather shew, that *God hath no pleasure in any such as at any time draw back to perdition*, then that *any in whom God hath pleasure, shall draw back*. And lastly, we deny, not an *actual drawing back of the best men*; and that so fat God hath *no pleasure in their actions* or services, in which respect such a passage is not an [unsavoury caution;] but had God no good will towards their *persons*, how come they to return? Sure, it is *his hand* which leads them *home*, and it is an especial part of his promise to his people to *heal their backslidings*. So that though *they too often draw back*, they never draw back so as to *perdition*, but *believe to the saving of their souls*.

You advance to that passage, *Matth.* 13. 20, 21. *But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the Word, and anon with joy receiveth it, yet hath he no root in himself, but dureth for a while; for when Tribulation or Persecution ariseth because of the Word, by and by he is offended.* SECT. 32

Hence you observe, [1. That these who believe only for a time, and afterward make defection, πρὸς καιρὸν, or as *Luke* οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύοντες, *Who believe for a season*, are true Believers.]

That is too much; all is said of them, is but, *that they believe*; *every belief* is not *true*; *every true belief* not enough to denominate men *true Believers*; the *Divels believe*, and have a true belief, at least assent to this, *That God will revenge himself on his enemies*; Will you dignifie them so far as to range them among *true Believers*?

[2. That the *Hearers* here described, are not compared to the *rock* or *stony ground* for the hardness of their hearts, in as much as they are said to *receive the Word with joy*; which argues an ingenuity or teachableness of spirit in them, and is elsewhere, *viz. Acts* 2.41. taken knowledg of by the Holy Ghost, as an Index or Sign of a *true Believer*; but for such a temper as this, *viz.* not to afford the Word radication in their hearts, so intimous, serious, and solid, which should be sufficient to maintain their belief of it, and good affections to it, against all such occurrences in the world, which may oppose or attempt either the one or the other,]

You have not proved, that the *hardness of their hearts* is not the *main thing* for which they are compared to the *stony ground*: Let them be so [*ingenuous*] as to *receive the Word with joy*, their *hearts* may be *hard enough*, notwithstanding. *Herod*, I take it, was of none of the *softest* tempers, yet he did *as much*, *heard* even *John*, a rough-hewen Preacher, *gladly*. They, *Acts* 2.41. *who heard*, or *received the Word gladly* were all Baptized: I am not sure they were all *saved*; they were all *Professors*, I am not bound to believe, as an Article of my Creed, that they were all *Believers*. *True Believers* have not *always* such *joy in Hearing*; all that *sometimes* take *such joy*, are not *true Believers*. The property of *true Believers*, is to take *gladly* enough the *harshest part of the Word*; the *sweeter* parts may go down so *pleasantly* with *others*. And as you well observe, that [a thin ground is apteſt to exhibit a speedy or sudden spring;] so may men who have least *ingenuity*, and most *hardness* in their hearts, be *more forward* then others, to receive *some parts* of the Word with *gladness*, so that this *receiving some parts of the Word with gladness*, proves them not so evidently, as you pretend, to be *true Believers*.

[But 3. (say you) As the blade which springs from the same kind of seed, though sowne in different soiles, is of the same kind; so the faith which springs from the same seed of the Gospel, must needs be of one and the same kind, though this seed be sown in hearts of never so *different a constitution* and *frame*; the temper of the heart not being able specifically to alter either the Gospel, or the natural fruit issuing from it.]

It were enough to answer, That *Similes* are not *proofs*, especially such as *this*, which doth not as much as *illustrate* that for which you produce it.

For 1. The *Blade* is the *Natural Effect of the Seed*; *Faith* is not of the *Word*.

2. The *Word* produceth, though in *some hearts*, *faith*, yet in *others hardness*, and opposition *against the Word*; now if *Temporary Faith* and *Saving Faith* be concluded to be of the *same kind*, because produced by the *Word*, as well may *Saving Faith*, and *hardness*, and *opposition* against the *Word*, be said to be of the *same kind*, because produced by the *Word*; it matters not though the *latter* be only by *accident*.

3. *Saving Faith* is an *habit* of Gods *immediate infusion*; *Temporary Faith* is not so.

4. And lastly, The temper of the heart, it is true, doth [not alter the Gospel, nor the natural effect of it,] for that is to be a *good savour to God in all*, and his glory is alwayes produced by it; but the Gospel, though the same, hath *different effects*, according as the ground is *variously qualified*, for to some it is the *savour of life unto life*, to others the *savour of death unto death*; and it is as natural to the Gospel to be attended with *one effect* as the *other*, according as God is pleased either to *better* the hearts of men by his Grace, or to *leave* them without it. However you make so strange of this, it is easily observed, in every other counsel, which given to a wise man, produceth *thanks*, and to a fool *rage*; the counsel is the same, the humour of the men to whom it is given different; *Quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis*; and accordingly works. Yea, it is no such strange thing for the *same Seed* in some grounds to bear *Barley*, and in others *Oats*. There are enough, I am sure, in our remote parts, who can aver it upon their experience; and you may see such a hint in Sir *Fr. Bacons* Natural History. You go on,

[4. As a blade, though blasted before the Harvest, is not hereby proved not to have been a true blade before it was blasted; so neither is Temporary faith, though lost, hereby proved not to have been true faith.]

I answer; The Reason is not the same: for though *all blades of Corn* be subject to *blasting*, yet *all faith is not*; yea, *true Faith grows* and *thrives* the better by *all endeavors to blast it*; and therefore that which is *blasted*, appears by the *blasting* not to have been *true*. If there be a *tree* which will not be *green in the winter*, we may safely conclude it is *no Bay*; if a stone which will not *endure knocking*, it is no *Adamant*. It is the nature of *true Faith* to *flourish* by *opposition*; to *grow stronger* by being *beaten*; and therefore that which is *lost*, and *perisheth* by *these means*, is not *true Faith*; for *true faith* sees such an *Excellency in Christ above other things*, as it counts all *losses gain* to *gain Christ*; a *Temporary Faith* may apprehend *some Excellency* in Christ, and above *many things*, but not above *all*, as *true faith doth*; *some joy*, but not above *all*, as *true faith doth*.

SECT. 33. But say you, [1. Such a faith as in the nature and kind of it differs from that which is true and justifying, the Scriptures know none.]

What think you of faith without works? What of the faith of Divels?

SECT. 34. [2. The temper of the faith in the *stony ground* did not arise from its own nature, but partly from the inward temper of the persons in whom it was seated, who neglected to give it rooting; partly from the outward occasions of trouble and persecutions. Nor is there any reason to conceive it would not have persevered, had it not been for these.]

I answer to the first: 1. That had the faith been *true*, it would have taken *such rooting*, as to have *overcome* that negligent humour; it would have *purified the heart*: True faith ever changing men, so as to make them *partakers of the divine nature*.

2. Men do not give *rooting* to faith: but *God*, who gives *faith* to men, gives *rooting*,

rooting to faith, and is both the *Author* and *Finisher* of it. According to your fancie, men are at least the *rooters* and *finishers* of their *faith*; and so make themselves *to differ*, if not from *unbeleevers*, yet from *lesse beleevers*; and may take this honour to themselves.

To the second I grant, [it was from the outward trouble, that the temporarie faith failed:] but had it been *true*, it would have *increased* by that very means which caused its failing: *Tribulation worketh patience. When I am weak, then I am strong*, saith *Paul*; and so may every true beleever, who hath just cause to *count it all joy when he falls into divers temptations, as knowing that the tryall of his faith worketh patience.* It is of the nature of *true faith*, not to *faile*, but *prosper* in *Persecutions*; the *Palmtree spreads* by being *loaden* and *depressed*. I am content to yeild you, That [there is no reason to conceive but that the Temporary faith would have persevered, had it not been persecuted.] But though in this case it had *persevered*, it had been nothing the more *True* or *Saving*; that *faith* is only *such*, which being convinced of an *Excellency in Christ above all other things*, *triumphs* in *suffering* for him, and holds it both a *happinesse* and *honour* to *lose all for his sake*, if it be called to it.

[3. But (say you) If the Temporarinesse of the Faith now under consideration, either caused or declared it to be specifically distinct from true and saving faith, then must perseverance, or an impossibilitie of falling, be of the essence of true faith. But if so, 1. No person can be look'd upon as a true believer, either by himself or others, till he die. 2 No person can be looked upon as such, after he is dead; for though hee did not fail, this sheweth but that it was possible he should have failed.] SECT. 35.

I answer, That *impossibility of failing* is of the *essence* of true faith, though not *constitutivè*, yet *consecutivè*; and this *impossibility* is founded, 1. Partly in the *nature of faith*, as which looks on all things that may be gotten by *deserting* Christ, as *losses*; on all things that may be *lost* by *adhering* to Christ, as *gains*; as being sensible of the *misery* of all *happinesse* without Christ, of the *happinesse* of all *misery* with Christ. *Without* him, all things are but *miserable comforters*; *with* him all are *comfortable miseries*. 2. Partly and principally, in the *promises* of God, and his *faithfulnesse* to make them good, and (which is more) his *unchangeablenesse*: so as there is an *impossibility* that hee should not fully *finish*, what he hath graciously *begun*.

To your first Consequence I yeeld, That [no man can be looked on by another as a true beleever, either before or after his death;] but in a judgment (as we call it) of *charity*: and you spake before of *Paul*, as if you had no absolute certaintie of his salvation, though you have [cause in abundance to judg so.] Alas, we are not bound to be confident of *anothers* salvation; but onely to make *our owne calling and Election sure*. It is *Christs* prerogative (*who knoweth the hearts of men*) to distinguish so accurately between the *sheep* and the *goats*. We look on *all* as *sheep*, who keep within the *fold*, without going too often *astray*.

To your second Consequence, for our *selves*, we may be sure; Partly by looking to the *root* of our faith, partly by looking to *Gods promises*, to preserve it.

1, We may know *we set Christ above all things*, deny our selves, take up Christs yoke, would take up the Cross, acknowledg our *own weaknesse*, but humbly *beg assistance of God*. And

2. We may as well, and much better know, *that God will not suffer us to be tempted above that we are able, but will with the temptation make a way for us to escape.*

You proceed, and confirme, that Perseverance is not an intrinsecal or essential property of true faith, but only a consequent that is contingent, and that by no less then five several Arguments:

[1. Because, according to the principles of your Adversaries, there is difference

ference between the gift of faith, and the gift of Perſeverance.]

I anſwer; Theſe gifts are diſtinguiſh'd *formally*, not *materially*; the gift of *Perſeverance* being but a *Perſevering of God in giving the gift of Faith*; Now where he *ever gives*, he *gives* it for ever. When you tell us [*Auſtin* tells us of ſome to whom God hath given Faith, yet not Perſeverance;] he means it of *faith of a lower ſtrain*, which is alſo *Gods gift*, and comes from *Heaven*, though it *bring not* men *thither*. If you reply, But God gives *ſuch faith to ſome of his children* to whom he gives *not Perſeverance*, according to *Auſtin*; I anſwer, Such men are ſtiled *his children*, in regard of *outward priviledges* only, not *inward*. *True faith* is of *thoſe gifts* whereof *God never repents*.

[2. But *Adam* (ſay you) had true Faith, yet not Perſeverance.

I anſwer; *Adams* faith was only in *his Creator*; this we ſpeak of, is faith in a *Redeemer*, a faith which *Adam* neither had, nor could have in the *ſtate of Innocence*: *Adams* faith did but lead him to *forbear doing amiſs*; this faith we are ſpeaking of, leads to *ſuffer wrongs*, and ſuch kinds of *temptations* as were not incident to *Adam* in his *integrity*.

[3. (You ſay) That Faith which is true, is not wont to be contradiſtinguiſhed to that which is *Temporary*, but well it may be diſtinguiſhed into that which *continueth* and that which *continueth not*.]

I anſwer, That faith which is *true*, is *formally* contradiſtinguiſhed to that which is *falſe*, but materially to that which is *Temporary*, becauſe *truth of faith* alwayes includes *perpetuity*; as a *true Souldier* is one who will not *turne his back cowardly*; and a *true Adamant*, is that which *will not be broken*.

[4. (You ſay) If the Temporary Believers faith had not been true, then could not their falling from it have been the cauſe of their final miſcarriage; but they would have ſo miſcarried though they had not fallen away.]

True, in reſpect of *Salvation*; but this miſcarriage is meant in reſpect of *profeſſion*, which makes their *Damnation heavier* then otherwiſe it would have been.

[5. And laſtly you tell us, That if their faith, of whom we are ſpeaking, were in the nature of it Temporary, then the accidental occaſions did not make it ſuch: but they did; for, for *lack of moiſture it withered away*.]

I anſwer, If this faith had been *true*, it had *given moiſture*, not *faded* for want of it; it had been, as *ſome ſeeds* are, a *dreſſing to the ground*; and ſo had laid an aſſured ground of *its continuance*; the *failing of it*, proves the *falſeneſs* of it.

SECT. 36. You addreſs your ſelf to anſwer ſuch Objections, as you conceive are apt to be made againſt what you have delivered, of the Truth and ſoundneſs of the faith of theſe Believers who were but Temporary.

And [1. If it be demanded (ſay you) If theſe alſo who are reſembled by the *ſtony ground* were true Believers, why are true and ſound Believers compared to the *good ground*? You anſwer, Not becauſe the faith of theſe perſons differed in nature, but in event; like as there is a different ſucceſs of the ſame Corn growing in *ſtony ground*, and in *good and fruitful ground*.]

I reply, Yea, but the difference of *event* in this caſe, ſhewes a difference of the *nature of the faith*: it being the property of *true faith* to *advantage it ſelf by diſcouragements*, to *riſe* by being *depreſſed*, to *ſprout* the faſter, the more it is *hindred* by oppoſition; and in a word, to *mend* the ground, be it never ſo *bad*, and to make it as *fruitful* as it found it *barren*: *true faith* is like ſome ſeed, which growes in any ground where once it gets entrance, and is not *warſted* by the ground but the ground is of courſe *bettered* by it.

[2. If it be objected, (ſay you) That the faith of the *ſtony ground* had *no root*, but the other faith *had*, and ſo they differed ſpecifically. You anſwer, The faith of the *ſtony ground*, is not ſaid to have had *no root*, as if it had had *none at all*; for then it could not have ſprouted and ſprung up as it did; but that it had

no

no root considerable to carry it through unto the harvest; no root comparatively in respect of the faith of the *good ground*.]

I reply, 1. That the meaning is not indeed, that it had *no root*, but that it had *no true root*; *viz.* it was not grounded on an apprehension of the *Excellency* of Christ; of an *happiness* even in *suffering for him*, and counting the *best* things, but *dung in comparison*; the *worst* as *Riches* in the *company* (as it were) *of Christ*: *Esteeming the Reproach of Christ greater Riches then the Treasures of Egypt*. This is the *true root of Faith*, an apprehension of our *lost estate without Christ*; of *our being saved by his sufferings for us*; of *our being honoured in being called to suffer for him*. *This root* the *faith in the stony ground* had *not*; had it *had it*, this *apprehension* would have had such an *influence* upon the *affections*, as would have made them *triumph* in *tribulation*, *exult* in *distresses*, *glory* in *persecutions*, prefer *Prisons* before *Palaces*, *Chains* before *Bracelets*, bind on *Calumnies* as *Crowns*, hug *faggots*, and welcome *every evil* for the name of Christ, as knowing these *evils* were but preparations for a *greater good*.

2. That though this *faith* of the *stony ground* might have *some slight apprehension* of an *Excellency in Christ*, yet of an *Excellency in Christ above all other things*, it had *not*.

3. That though [*more* or *less rooting* makes no Specifical difference,] and so doth not *more* or *less* knowledge of the *Excellency of Christ*, but *knowledg* of *more* or *less Excellency* in Christ *doth*: the *knowledg of more* or *less Excellency* relates to the *Object*, and accordingly differs *specifically*; *more* or *lesse knowledge* of the *Excellency in Christ*, relates but to the *subject*, and so differs but *gradually*.

[If it be yet further objected, (say you) That the *faith of the stony ground* yeilded *no fruit*, whereas the faith of the *good ground* is said to *bring forth fruit with patience*, doth not this argue a specifical difference between them? You answer, Neither; yea, those very words *with patience*, (which are distinguishing) clearly imply, That the *faith of the stony ground* did bring *forth fruit*, and that it came short of the *good ground* only in *this*, that this *brought forth fruit with patience*.] SECT. 37.

I answer, 1. Let the *stony ground* be yeilded to bring *forth fruit*, so it were not *with patience*, the *fruit* was not *good*, and so shewes a sufficient *difference* between the *stony ground* and the *good*: *Vines* and *thorns* do both yeild *fruit*, yet I trow, differ more then *gradually*.

2. I deny that the *stony ground* did *bring forth fruit*; 1. The Text speaks of *none*. 2. It saith, that *as soon as the Sun was up* (which was sure before the time of fruit) *it withered away*; well it might *sprout*, it seems it did not so much as *kern*. 3. These words, *with patience*, do not imply a *bearing of fruit in the other ground*, but shewes the *reason* why the *good* bare fruit when the *other did not*, it *had patience*; *with patience*, are words shewing the *cause* of the *good grounds bearing*, not simply the *quality* of the fruit, or the *maturity* of it.

3. Let the faith of *stony ground* be as *fruitful* as you would have it, if it were not able to *endure sufferings with patience*, it wanted that Characteristical property of that of the *good ground*, and consequently was of a *different species*; this bears *most fruit* in time of *suffering*, and is never more gloriously *plentiful* then in the midst of the *hardest seasons*; when the *Sun scorcheth*, then it especially *flourisheth*; when *all means* are used to make it *barren*, then it yeilds the *most eminent Crop*, it being natural to it to *improve* it self by those very *means* which *others* take to *hinder it*.

When you say, That [had not this *stony ground* been some wayes fruitful, and made such a profession of the Gospel as rendreth men obnoxious to persecution from the world, there had been no cause why it should either have suffered or feared persecution.] You seem to forget the *guise of Persecutors*, which strike at any *profession*, though never so *unfruitful*; and *hate* as well the *name* as the *faith* of

of Christians. Besides, how appears it that *this faith* suffered any persecution, and did not prevent it by crying quarter, and yeilding the Cause at the first onset? and yet *some persecution* it might possibly draw on it self, by an unwarranted *forwardness*; as some men who have *little grace*, have a *competent measure of boldness*; and do many things out of *humor*, which they are quickly *sorry* for, and which they never cordially *affected*. Your jigg of fruitfulness and unfruitfulness, [That they make no different species, else the same tree that beareth fruit one year, and is barren another; and the faith of true Believers, which is sometimes *unfruitful*, as when they go astray like lost Sheep, and that by the confession of your Adversaries, is of different species;] may make pretty Musick to such eares as are taken with every *fiddle*, but carrieth nothing in it that *tunes*, or hath any tolerable *harmony* with the *present Discourse*.

1. *Fruitfulness* and *unfruitfulness*, where *natural*, make a *different species*; as I take it an *Ash* and an *Apple tree* are not of the *same species* with *you*. Now the *one* doth *naturally* bring forth *fruit*, the *other not*; well it may yeild *leaves* and *keyes*, *fruit* it bears *none*. And therefore

2. Though a tree, fruitful one year and barren another, be still of the same kind, yet a tree yeilding, though never so little fruit, and though but for one year, is different in kind from that which *will never yeild any fruit*.

3. The *faith of stony ground* never yeilded fruit, God looked on it as *impossible* to please him, by any *fruit unto Holiness*, as much as it might yeild somewhat *glorious* enough to the *eyes of men*.

4. The *faith of the good ground* need not be said to bear fruit all the *year long*; What ground I pray doth so? it is enough it doth it in its *season*.

5. Yet do the [lost sheep] as you wander in your Simile, bear *somewhat* while they are *lost*; their *wool* may *grow*, and sure there is some *fruit* appearing in *true faith*, when it *failes most*; *viz.* it keeps Believers from *sinning to that height* which otherwise they *would do*; and *grace* may be discerned amidst their *slips*, as well as *corruption* amidst the *carnal mens best and most specious works*.

SECT. 38. [You here tell us, you think but of one Objection more which knowes how to appear against the Truth of the faith of the stony ground, or Temporaries in the Parable; and it is this, That true faith alwayes includes a purpose of heart to suffer persecution; but the faith of the Temporaries wanted this property. To this you answer,

1. That *true faith* doth not in the precise or formal notion of it, include such a purpose, though such a purpose be seminally or virtually included in it.] It is enough that this purpose is *so far* included; yea, in an apprehension of a *gain* by *loss* for Christ.

[2. That it cannot be proved, that such a purpose was not in these Temporaries: their non induring proves not a non purpose to endure.] Yea, but the purpose we speak of, is such as would not fail to exert it self into Act, upon occasion; and rather *dy* upon the place, then draw back.

3. [That it is evident, That Temporaries did endure persecution for a while for the profession of faith.] Add, against their wills; but *true faith* apprehends that *Excellency in Christ* that it *rejoyceth to suffer*; *others* may *suffer for a while*, *this* will not *suffer* it self to *step back*, nor *accept deliverance*, *in hope of a better Resurrection*. *This* layes a foundation for it in the *Excellency of Christ*, and the *happinesse of enjoying* him upon *what ever termes*; yea, the *happiness of enjoying him the more*, in *losing all things for him*. Hence they *take joyfully the spoiling of their goods*, *knowing that they have in Heaven a better and a more enduring substance*; yea, the *sentence of death*, as being assured that to *them to live is Christ*, and to *dye is gain*; that while they are *present in the body*, *they are absent from the Lord*. And thus the *faith of those who are but Temporaries*, is evinced to be of *another kind*.

And

And whereas you tell us, [Our Saviours blaming it only for non-tooting, or firm fixation in the ſoul, gives teſtimony unto it in point of ſoundneſs, for that no man deſerves blame for not endeavouring the perpetuation of an Hypocritical faith in his ſoul.]

We do not ſay the *faith* was *Hypocritical*; we ſay, the *men* were *Hypocrites*, notwithſtanding *ſuch a faith*, as which did not apprehend that *Excellency in Chriſt*, which was ſufficient to make them *ſincere*; they had but a *weak glympſe* of *ſome ſmall Excellency in him*; and becauſe they did not apprehend the ſufficiency of Chriſt above and beyond all things, to make them *happy*, even in the *worſt outward condition*, hence they fell. This apprehenſion, by the aſſiſtance of God, enables true Believers to ſtand the faſter the more they are ſhaken.

I ſhall not trouble my ſelf with what followes in the next Section, as having ſufficiently ſcanned this Text of *Peter*, in my Anſwer to your 45, 46, 47, 48. Sections of your eighth Chapter: But in lieu of examining the Sanctity of theſe Apoſtates, I ſhall here take liberty to make a ſhort Digreſſion, and briefly enquire, Whether there be not a ſpecifical difference between thoſe *acts*, the very *higheſt* which are found in *ſeeming* holy ones, and thoſe in the very loweſt degree, which are found in *real Saints*? And whether there be not ſomewhat in *thoſe* which makes them come up to *true Holineſs*; and *nothing* in the other but what leaves them to fall *below it*. To this purpoſe, I ſhall deſire Mr. *Baxters* patience, whiles I fairly examine what he hath been pleaſed to deliver in the third Part of his Book of the *Saints Everlaſting Reſt*, *Chap.* 11. from *Sect.* 12. to the end of that Chapter. 2 Pet. 2. 20.

Digreſſion.

Mr. *B.* SECT. XII.

PROP. 12.

[THE ſincerity of Saving Grace, as ſaving, lieth materially, not in the bare Nature of it, but in the Degree: Not in the Degree conſidered Abſolutely in it ſelfe, but Comparatively, as it is prevalent againſt its contrary. {Digreſſiō touching Mr *Baxter*.}

I cannot expect that the Reader ſhould ſuddenly receive this Truth, though of ſo great conſequence, that many mens Salvations are concerned in it (as I ſhall ſhew anon) till I have firſt made it plain. Long have I been poring on this Doubt, *Whether the ſincerity, and ſo the difference between the Hypocrite and a true Chriſtian, do conſiſt in the nature, or only in the degree? Whether it be a gradual or ſpecifical difference?* And I never durſt conclude that it lay but in the degree. 1. Becauſe of the ſeeming force of the Objections which I ſhall anon anſwer. And 2. Becauſe of the conſtant contrary judgment of all thoſe Divines whom I highlieſt valued, (for though I am aſhamed of mine own ignorance, yet I do not repent that I received ſome things upon truſt from the Learned, while I was learning and ſtudying them; or that I took them by a humane faith, when I could not reach to take them by a Divine faith; only I then muſt hold them but as opinions, but not abſolutely, as Articles of my Creed;) but I am convinced of my former miſtake, and ſhall therefore endeavour to rectifie others, being in a matter of ſuch moment.]

I have no great reaſon to wonder, that you have ſo little expectation of the Readers ſudden reception of this rare notion; but I much marvel, Why ſhould you dignifie it ſo highly, as to ſay, [It is of that conſequence that many mens Salvations are concerned in it?] Surely, if it be a *Truth*, it is ſuch as that *all mens*

Digreſſiõ touching Mr Baxter.

Salvation are concerned in it: if it be not, *no mans Salvation* is concerned in it. How well you anſwer the Objections againſt it, I ſhall examine anon; in the mean time the [contrary Judgment,] and that [conſtant,] and that [of thoſe Divines whom you valued, and highlieſt; and all thoſe Divines] makes me humbly conceive, you will not be at all offended at my friendly diſcuſſion of thoſe worthy Reaſons of yours, which prevailed with you to deſert [all thoſe Divines,] and to embrace this notion, belike as [an Article of *your* Creed,] though it be not in the Apoſtles. And truly all the Articles in that are penned much more intelligibly then this your new point, which you ſeeme to take up with a [Divine Faith.] I ſee not how *Humane Reaſon* can make over-much *ſenſe* of it. Say you,

[1. The ſincerity of Saving Grace, as Saving, lieth materially not in the bare Nature of it, but in the Degree.]

1. I underſtand not what you mean by [the ſincerity of Saving Grace, as Saving.] A man may be *ſincere* in *many things* which will not bring him to *Heaven*; *nothing* will bring him to *Heaven* but that wherein he is *ſincere*. The *Savingneſs* of Grace depends on the *ſincerity*; the *ſincerity* depends not on the *Savingneſs* of it, but is of courſe in the order of nature *before* it.

2. I am as much to ſeek what you aime at in ſaying, [The ſincerity of Saving Grace lieth materially not in the bare nature of it, but in the degree.]

1. To what doth this [*materially*] refer, but to [ſincerity of Saving Grace?] Well then the [ſincerity of Saving Grace lieth materially, not in the bare nature of it.] Then a man may have *ſincere Saving Grace in the nature of it*, yet not *ſincerity of Saving Grace*; for [the ſincerity of Saving Grace materially, lies not in the bare nature of it,] and the [nature of Sincerity in Saving Grace] may bee without [ſincerity in Saving Grace.] You had indeed no great cauſe to think an ordinary Readers intellectuals could advance themſelvs upon a ſudden to ſuch ſublime ſpeculations.

2. To what is this [materially] oppoſed, but to *formally*? now then the meaning muſt be, either 1. That ſincerity of Saving Grace doth lye *formally* in the bare nature of it, though not *materially*, and that is yet a *note higher*. Or elſe, 2. That it doth not lye as much as [materially,] much leſs *formally* in the bare nature of it; and that is indeed a *pinne lower*, but which you needed not have feared any one would have *ſtooped to*; it is not *as much as materially*.

3. If this *it* will help, referring *it* to Grace, I may have hope to attain your meaning, thus; The ſincerity of ſaving Grace, as Saving; lyeth not materially in the bare nature of it, the *Grace*, but in the *Degree*; but then a man may have *Saving Grace*, yet not be *ſincere*, and ſo a man may be *ſaved* (for it is not *Saving Grace*, if it will not help bring him to *Salvation*) and yet not be *ſincere*. I am juſt where I was, and am as unable to conſtrue this Engliſh Propoſition, as the Coptick Tranſlation of the Scripture.

Well, I will take it for granted, that I have hit the meaning of the firſt part of the Propoſition, ſuch as it is: Now to the

2d. [Not in the Degree conſidered abſolutely, in it ſelf; but comparatively, as it is prevalent againſt its contrary.]

1 Here I cannot ſee but that *every degree of grace*, in its own nature carries a *prevalence againſt the contrary in ſuch a degree*: For as for inſtance, Heat to *two degrees* prevails againſt *two degrees* of cold; and heat to *three*, againſt *three* degrees of cold; and heat to *four*, againſt *four*; heat to *five*, leaves but *three* degrees of cold; and heat to *ſix* but *two*, to *ſeven* but *one*. So accordingly, *every degree of ſaving grace* doth of courſe prevail over the *contrary* according to *proportion*; nay, (which is more) as in water, leſſe then ſo much as *one ſenſible degree* of *cold* prevails above *many of heat*, and works them out in time: ſo doth even *one* degree, or if it may be leſſe, any one *ſcruple* of *ſaving grace* prevail in time over *all* degrees of the contrary; and if there be but *one* ſuch degree of *ſaving grace*,

it

it will in time conquer all that ſhall oppoſe it: ſo that every degree of ſaving grace carries in it a prevalencie over the contrary. But perhaps his meaning is, that *ſincerity* of ſaving grace lies not in a *virtuall*, but an *actuall* prevalence over the contrarie: but if ſo, that actual prevalence is either 1 In regard of the *habit in it ſelf*, that there muſt be more degrees of the *habit* of grace, then of *corruption*; and then no habit of grace, unleſſe to ſuch a degree as over-balanceth *corruption*, will denominate a man *ſincere*. *Grace*, like a *grain of muſtard ſeed* in any greater proportion of *corruption*, wil not do it; the *pearl* of *grace* is to weigh as much as the *flint* in a mans heart, and ſomewhat more, or elſe he is not *ſincere*: and if a man muſt be able to calculate his *grace* and his *corruption* ſo exactly, ere he can eſtimate the *ſincerity* of his grace, ſurely none can be aſſured of his *ſincerity* without a greater skill in the Mathematicks, then I humbly conceived had been neceſſary to that purpoſe. Or elſe 2 In regard of the habit in its *operation*; then no man is *ſincere*, longer then he doth *actually* conquer all that oppoſeth that, whereunto *ſaving grace* doth in its nature lead: but then farewell the *ſincerity of all beleevers*, whenever they are foiled by their *corruptions*, and conſequently they fall *totally* from ſaving grace; which I do not think that Mr. *B.* is yet grown hardy enough to affirm.

Digreſſiõ touching Mr *Baxter*.

We conceive they may *ſin* and yet be *ſincere*; yea, *ſerve the law of ſin* in their *fleſh*, and yet in their *minde ſerve the law of God*. So that *ſincerity* is not to be appropriated onely to *ſuch a prevalency of the degres of grace over the contrary*. But poſſibly his meaning is, that ſinceritie of *ſaving grace* lies in ſuch a degree as is prevalent, or greater, viz. *appretiative*, though not *intenſive*. As for inſtance, a mans love to *God* and holy duties may be *appretiative* greater, and yet his love to his *children intenſive* greater: as his ſorrow for diſpleaſing God may be *appretiative* greater, yet his ſorrow for drawing a miſchief on himſelf or his family *intenſive* greater; and he may accordingly *weep more* for this, and *leſſe* for that. Now *ſincerity of ſaving grace* lies in ſuch a degree of grace as is *appretiative greater* then the contrary, and *prevails* againſt it; that is, as makes him love *God appretiative* more then he loves the *world*; and ſorrow for offending God *appretiative*, more then he ſorrows for loſing all that he hath in the world. If this be the meaning, it is a truth, but very unhappily expreſt; for ſurely there is *no degree of grace* but is *thus prevalent* over the contrary; that is, makes a man *value* the things of *God*, above all thoſe of the *world*; and accordingly puts his *affections* into ſuch a poſture, as to devote themſelves to *Chriſt*, more then all the things of the *world*; and to be diſpleaſed with themſelves that they do not exert themſelves more in the things of *God*, then all the things of the *world*. This is built upon that apprehenſion of the *excellency* of Chriſt, in compariſon whereof, *all things* are but as *droſs* and *dung*: But this now lieth not ſure in ſuch a *degree of grace* (as *viz. Faith*, or *Love*, or *holy ſorrow*) as is prevalent againſt the *contrary*, *viz.* to theſe graces; but in an apprehenſion of the *dignity* and worth of *Chriſt*, which is beyond that of *all things* which ſhall at any time preſume to conteſt with him for a place in our *ſoul*, and relates to the *object* of our *faith* and *love*, and that which is contrary to *it*; not to the *degree* of our faith and love, and that which is contrary to *it*. Beſides, if we make the *ſincerity* of grace to lie in a *prevalency* againſt the *contrary* to it, then where there is nothing *contrary* to it, there is no *grace*: for there can be no *prevalency* againſt the contrary, where there is no *contrary* againſt which this prevalencie may be; and conſequently, there is no *ſincerity* among the Saints in *heaven*, as who have nothing *contrary* to grace in them, againſt which there is any place for *prevalency*; and ſo their grace being ſo far exalted *above* the *contrary*, as not to have any longer place left for *prevalency* againſt it, which alwaies ſuppoſeth a *being* and *reſiſting* of the *contrary*, ſhall loſe its title and claim to the appellation of *ſincerity*. Thus hath Mr *Baxter* put the *ſincerity of ſaving grace* in ſuch a *degree* as 1 is not found in *many* on earth, who have not attained ſo high, yet have grace that is *ſaving*: and 2 is not found in *any* in heaven, who have attained to ſo high a degree of grace, as that there is no place for this *prevalency* over

{Digreſſiõ touching Mr Baxter.}

the *contrary*. Much of that which we call *ſaving grace*, is not *loſt*, but *augmented*, in thoſe who are *actually poſſeſt of ſalvation*; and *glory*, we conceive, is little more then a *fuller meaſure of Grace*.

[You muſt remember (ſaith Mr. *B.*) that I have ſhewed you already, that God hath not made any act, conſidered in its meer nature, without conſidering it as in this prevailing degree, to be the condition of ſalvation, and that a wicked man may perform an act for the nature of it, which a true Chriſtian may do.] This I ſuppoſe ſhould have been [*any act* for the nature of it;] elſe to ſay, [a wicked man may perform an act which a true Chriſtian may do,] is to ſay *nothing*.

Well, I ſhall have recourſe to what you have ſaid to this purpoſe; and I find it in this *Chap.* 11. *Sect.* 10. *Prop.* 9. thus:

[There is no one act conſidered in its meer nature and kind, without its meaſure and (*A*) ſutableneſs to its object, which a true Chriſtian may perform, but an unſound Chriſtian may perform it alſo. If any doubt of this, we might ſoon prove it by producing the moſt excellent Acts, and ſhewing it of them in particular. (*B*) *Believing*, is as proper to the ſaved as any thing, for the *Act*; and yet as for the (*C*) *Aſſenting Act*, *James* tell us, *the Divels believe*; and as for *Reſting on Chriſt by affiance*, and expecting *pardon* and *ſalvation* from him, we ſee beyond queſtion, that many thouſand wicked men have no other way to quiet them in ſinning, but that they are confident Chriſt will pardon and ſave them; and they undiſſemblingly quiet and reſt their ſouls, in this perſwaſion; and undiſſemblingly expect ſalvation from him, when they have ſinned as long as they can:] And indeed, herein lies the nature of *Preſumption*; [and ſo real are they in this faith, that all our Preaching cannot beat them out of it. If the Queſtion be, Whether a wicked man can (*D*) *pray*, or *meditate*, or *forbear* the Act of this or that ſin? I think none will deny it.]

(*A*) I anſwer, That [the ſutableneſs of the Act to its Object,] as you call it, is of the *nature* of the Act, and makes it *ſpecifically* diſtinct in *ſpecie moris*, from any *other act* of the ſame kind *in ſpecie naturæ*, which is not ſuted to the *ſame Object*. As for inſtance, *Love of God*, and *love of Evil*, are both *love*, and ſo in *one ſpecies*, *in ſpecie naturæ*; and neither can be found, either 1. in an *inanimate*; or 2. a *meer vegetable* Creature; or 3. in a *meer ſenſitive* Creature; but they are in different ſpecies, in *ſpecie moris*; and the *Object* is that which makes the *difference*, *in ſpecie*. Now if your meaning be, That a wicked man can *love evil*, as well as a Chriſtian *love good*; it is not ſo rare a notion, as you had need to ſpend too much ink about it. This I think every man is ſufficiently acquainted with, and needs not be indoctrinated anew. But if your meaning be, that a wicked man can *love good*, I mean *Spiritually*, though not with ſo ſutable a *love to good*, as well as a Chriſtian; this I deny, and ſhall ſhew reaſon for it anon, when I come to examine that *Pelagian Drugg*, which you vent, of a *Natural mans weak power to do Spiritual good*; and ſhall ſhew, that he cannot have as much as the *leaſt love to it*; and that the *greateſt Maſter of meer Morality* cannot *poſſibly attain* to the ſmalleſt degree of *that love* which is found in the *weakeſt man* that is *Regenerate by the Spirit of God*.

(*B*) When you ſay, [*Believing* is as proper to the *Saved*, as any thing, for the Act,] If by [*Saved*] you mean ſuch as are *actually ſaved*: *Believing* is an act nothing ſo proper to them, as *loving*; for *Faith* is ſwallowed up in *ſight*, which is of another ſpecies; but *Love* is only *perfected* to a *higher degree*. If by [*Saved*] you mean ſuch as *ſhall be ſaved*; then *believing* for the *act*, without reference to the *Object*, *Gods Promiſes in Chriſt*, is not as *proper* to them as any *other act*: for ſure it is *common* to *them*, and the *wickedeſt* men on earth: And as they who *ſhall be ſaved*, *believe Gods Promiſes in Chriſt*; ſo thoſe who *ſhall be damned*, *believe* the Worlds, the Fleſhes, the Divels *Promiſes* of happineſs *without Chriſt*.

(*C*) Well, but *Believing*, 1. As to the [*Act of aſſenting*, *is found in the Divels*.] We do not ſay, that *Believing* conſiſts in a *meer aſſenting*, but in an *aſſenting*

senting for the Authority of God, which whether or no the *Divels* do, is more then you can prove. Digreſſiō touching Mr Baxter.

2. [As to the Act of *relying on Chriſt by affiance, and expecting pardon and ſalvation from him*, we ſee it beyond queſtion, that many thouſand wicked men have no other way to quiet them in ſinning, but this.] Sir, Theſe, while they *expect pardon and ſalvation from Chriſt, continuing wicked*, ſhew they are ſo far from *believing him*, that they do no leſs then give him the *lye*; as who hath ſaid, *None ſhall have any benefit by him, but ſuch as are laden with ſorrow for their ſins, and are carried with a juſt indignation againſt them.* So that neither *aſſenting*, ſuch as is found in the *Divels*; nor *affiance*, ſuch as is found in *wicked men*, come near the *acts of Believing* which are found in the *Saints*; but are as far from them as *Hell* is from *Heaven*. *Theſe acts*, and *thoſe* of the *Saints* differ *ſpecie moris*, though *aſſenting* and *affiance* in the one and the other *agree* in *ſpecie naturæ*: and yet they *agree not in ſpecie ultima* neither; for the *Divels aſſenting* is but to the *threatnings*, which makes them *tremble*, not (for ought you can ſhew) to the *Promiſes*; and *wicked mens affiance*, as you call it, is rather upon a *general mercy in God*, and *his Son Jeſus Chriſt*, not upon any *particular Promiſe* held forth in the Scripture; had you ſhewed that there had been in the *Divels* and *wicked men ſuch aſſenting* and *affiance* as are in the *Saints*, but in a *leſs degree*, you had done your work; now you have but loſt your labour. For what is this to tell us ſo ſolemnly, *That wicked men can perform all the kinds of acts which Saints do* in genere naturæ? Do you think that any of thoſe Divines, ſo highly valued by you, who you pretend are of a *conſtant oppoſite judgment* to you in this *great Point, wherein the ſalvation of many is concerned*, did ever *conceive*, or as much as *dream* the *contrary*? Alas, they wil tel you that wicked men cannot only do the *ſame kinds of acts, in genere naturæ*, but do them in a *higher degree* then the Saints do. The *wicked mens zeal to their mammon*, may make that of the *Saints of God* to bluſh, it falls ordinarily ſo ſhort of it. *The children of this world*, as they have more *wiſdom*, ſo *ſtronger affections*, in *their generation*, then the *children of light*. It ſeems ſome of Mr. *B*'s highly valued Divines are to ſeek, whether the *Wicked* and *Saints* have the *ſame Humane Nature*, and accordingly can do *all the ſame kind of acts in genere naturæ*, and are extremely obliged to his more learned Maſterſhip, for affording them ſo conſiderable an *Illumination*, in this *obſcure*, but *neceſſary* Point.

(*D*) Laſtly, What if [none will deny it, that a wicked man can pray, meditate, forbear the act of this or that ſin?] doth this prove that they can, and do do *any act* that a Saint doth, though they do it only in a *leſs degree*? 1. [*To forbear an act, of this or that ſin*,] is not to act. 2. [To *meditate*,] is not an act pretended by any man (that I have ever heard of) to be *proper to the Saints*; *all* men do it *more* or *leſs*. 3. For [*Praying*,] I deny that a wicked man doth it. *Praying*, in the very nature of it, is a *humble offering up our deſires to God in the name of Chriſt, for ſuch things as make for Gods glory.* Wicked men may *beg*, they never yet *prayed*; their *Prayers* were at moſt but ſhadowes of Prayers, and have no more right to the name of Prayers, then a *dead man*, yea, a *painted* man hath to the name of *man*: for want of fitter words, we *call them ſo*; we have all more reaſon then to *think them* ſuch as *we call them*.

Having ſtept out of the way to take in this reference, I now return to the place from whence I came; where you ſet your ſelfe to conſider the Propoſition more diſtinctly.

The Propoſition was, That *ſincerity of ſaving Grace lieth not in the bare nature of it, but in the degree, &c.* To clear this, you tell us, [That Divines give the title of ſaving Grace to four things,

The firſt is, *Gods purpoſe of ſaving us*; Now, ſay you, 1. The queſtion is not of this.] I verily believe you; for when you ask, Whether ſincerity of ſaving grace conſiſt in the nature or degrees of it, it may be ſuppoſed you ſpeak of that grace, which is attended with ſincerity in us, we being the *ſubjects* of it, not only the *objects*, as we are, of grace, in this ſenſe.

2. This

Digreſſiõ touching Mr Baxter.

[2. This is an immanent act in God, where no doubt, there is no ſpecifical difference, when Divines accord, that there is no diverſity or multiplicity at all, but perfect unity, allowing ſtill the unſearchable myſtery of the Trinity; therefore I reſt confident, that no Solid Divine will ſay, That Gods common love or grace to the unſanctified, doth by a natural ſpecification, differ from his ſpecial love and grace to his choſen, as they are in God.]

And what of this? 1. I dare ſay more, That I am confident, no ſober Divine will affirm, that *Gods ſpecial love and grace to his Choſen*, doth by a *natural ſpecification*, (to imitate your Scholaſtical Phraſiologie) differ from Gods *hatred* of the veſſels of wrath, as this *love* and *hatred* are *in God*. But

2. Dare you ſay, That Gods *common love* or *grace* to the *unſanctified*, doth differ in *degree* from his *ſpecial love to his Elect*, as you make the ſincerity of ſaving grace to lye not in the bare nature, but the degree?

3. Sir, This *common love of God*, as you call it, to the *unſanctified*, and *ſpecially to his Elect*, are not in God *formally*, albeit they are *attributed* to him, becauſe of his *Operations*; and I may ſafely ſay, that thoſe *Operations* of his *differ ſpecie*, as I ſhall ſhew in my conſideration of the next parcel of your diſcourſe: in the mean time all this is *irrelative* to the buſineſs you take in hand.

[The ſecond thing (ſay you) which is commonly called *ſaving grace*, is the *act of God*, by which the Spirit infuſeth or worketh the ſpecial habitual ſaving gifts in the ſoul, not the *effect*, but the *act* of the Holy Ghoſt which worketh this *effect*; this is called *gratia operans*; as the *effect* in us is called *gratia operata*; grace wrought in us. Now

1. This is none of it that we enquire after in the Queſtion in hand, when we ask, Whether the Truth of Grace, lye onely in the Comparative or prevailing Degree?] Very likely: I obſerve only this, That here you change your terme; and in ſteed of *Sincerity* uſe the word *Truth*, which truly is much more proper.

[2. If it were, there is no place for ſuch a doubt.

1. Becauſe no man can prove ſuch natural ſpecifick difference in the Acts of God, nor will (I think) affirm them.] You ſhould ſay *it*; Yes, I both affirme and prove ſuch a ſpecifick difference in the Acts of God, *Creating* and *Deſtroying*, *Drowning* and *Burning* the world; *both* are *Acts of God*; and I appeal to any indifferent man, Whether there be not a *ſpecifick difference in theſe acts*? ſurely, if *any acts* be *ſpecifically different*, *theſe* are; if there be a *ſpecifick* difference between *Creating* and *altering*, the one being terminated in *ſubſtance*, the other in *quality*, there is much more between *creating* and *deſtroying*, the *one* being terminated in *ens*, the *other* in *non ens*.

[2. Eſpecially (ſay you) becauſe in the Judgement of great Divines, there is no ſuch act of God at all, diſtinct from his Eſſence and immanent eternal acts, ſo that this is the ſame with the former.]

1. I know no great Divine, ſave only one Learned Mr. *Baxter*, that preſumes to affirm this. That Gods *Immanent Eternal acts* are not really diſtinct from his *Eſſence*, is (I confeſs) the judgment of all ſober Divines, yet of all others Mr. *Baxter* ſhould not ſay it, as who hath endeavoured to prove, that there may be *new Immanent acts in God*, which if they be the ſame with his *Eſſence*, is *impoſſible*, unleſs he may have either a *new Eſſence*, or ſomewhat *new in his Eſſence*, both which ſound alike congruouſly. But hath God *no Acts* (trow you) but *Immanent* and *Eternal*? What think you of his *creating*? what of his *deſtroying* the world? Well, but ſay you, [God doth not need to put forth any act but his meer willing it, for the producing of any effect.]

1. What need is there then I pray, of ſuch an Attribute as his *Power*? we may omit *that*, and refer all his actings to his *Will*.

2. By his Will *immediately*, he doth nothing at all upon the *Creature*: for ſeeing the *acts* of his *Will* are all *immanent*, they have no term *ad extra*, and ſo *nothing* is immediately produced by *them*.

You

You go on though; [If a man will have a ſtone moved, his will cannot ſtir it, but it muſt be the ſtrength of his arme; but *God* doth but will it, and it is done, as Doctor *Twiſſe* once or twice ſaith, but *Bradwardine* and others fully confirm.] What, that God needs no *armes* to move ſtones or mountains, but that his *will* produceth ſuch effects without the mediation of ſuch *Organs*? nor is this more then is found in the *Angels*, who have no ſuch *members*; yea, and a *mans ſoul* hath no *fingers* whereby to move his *arme*, yet I hope theſe are not moved by the *will*, *without the miniſtring of ſubſervient powers*; and albeit we put no *Power* in God, *really diſtinct* from his *Will*, yet do we *rationally* aſcribe a *Power* to him, as *diſtinct* from his *Will*, as his *Will* is from his *Eſſence*; that is, as *Scotus*, *formally*; or as *Aquinas*, *ratione ratiocinata*. It is true what you add, [Gods Will is his Eſſence;] *viz. realiter*, not *formaliter*; and ſo his *Will* and *Power* are the *ſame really one* with *another*, and *both* with his *Eſſence*, but *formally diſtinct*. But will you ſay, That the *Acts* of *Creating* and *Deſtroying* the world, are *really* the ſame with his *Eſſence*? Theſe *Acts* are *tranſient*, and ſo are the ſame with the *terme* or *effect*, not with the *agent*, and are not ſaid to be *in the agent* but the *patient*: So that albeit *Gods Will*, and the *acts of it* be *really the ſame*, as being *in God*, in whom there is no place for *difference*; yet Gods *creating the world*, and *altering* it, are in the *Creatures*, and ſo are *different*, not only from Gods *Eſſence*, but from *one another*. And this indifferently well appeares by what you add, [God never did begin, or ceaſe to will any thing, though he will the beginning and ceaſing of things;] for therefore the *beginning* and *ceaſing* of things, are diſtinct from *Gods Will*; and conſequently the *actions* whereby the *beginning* and *ceaſing* of things is effected; being really the ſame with the *beginning* and *ceaſing* of things, muſt alſo be diſtinct from *Gods will*. [He willed (ſay you) the *Creation* and *Diſſolution* of the world at *once*, from *Eternity*, though he willed from Eternity that it ſhould be created and diſſolved in *time*;] therefore ſay I, 1. The *Creation* and *Diſſolution* of the world, being in *time*, are *really diſtinct* from the *act* of Gods *will*, which was from *Eternity*; and next, the *acts* whereby the worlds *Creation* and *Diſſolution* are effected, being the ſame really with the *Creation* and *Diſſolution* of the world (as all *tranſient acts* are the ſame with their *termes*) are in *time* alſo, and ſo *really diſtinct* from the *act* of Gods *will*. It is true, what you ſay, [That the *Effect* only doth begin and end, but not the *Cauſe*:] but though the *Cauſe* do not either *begin* or *end*, yet the *actions* whereby the *Cauſe* produceth theſe *Effects*, doth both *begin* and *end*, as the *Effects* with which they are really the ſame, do.

{Digreſſio touching Mr Baxter.}

You conclude, [This is our ordinary Metaphyſical Divinity: if any Vulgar Reader think it beyond his capacity, I am content that he move in a lower Orb: But doubtleſs, we muſt not faine a natural ſpecifick difference of Acts in God.]

Truly Sir, you are extraordinary in your new notions, and your head hath run round in your higher Orb, wherein no Scholaſtical Reader, what ever a Vulgar one may do, will be very deſirous to keep you company; yet doubtleſſe we do not fain a *natural ſpecifick difference of acts in God*; we only ſpeak of ſuch a difference of acts *from God* in the caſes mentioned. Yet according to the *ſpecifick difference* of *acts from God*, we are neceſſitated to attribute *Exactneſs* to God of a *natural ſpecifick difference* in *themſelves*, as *Juſtice* and *Mercy*, *Love* and *Hatred*; and ſure there is more then a difference in *degree*, which you ſeem to contend for, between the *common love of God* (as you call it) to *unſanctified men* and his *ſpecial love to his Choſen*, like as are the *Diſpenſations* of God to them. But all this hitherto, is meerly impertinent to your queſtion, *Concerning the ſincerity of ſaving grace, whether it lye in the bare nature of it, or rather in the degree.* You proceed,

[The *third* thing which we commonly call *ſaving grace*, is the ſpecial effects of this work of the Spirit on the ſoul, commonly called, *Habitual Grace*, or the *Spirit in us*, or the *Seed of God abiding in us*, or our *Real holineſs*, or our *New nature*. Now

Digreſſiõ touching Mr Baxter.

[1. Our Queſtion is not directly and immediately of this, *whether common and ſpecial grace do differ more then by the formentioned degree*; for this is not that which a Chriſtian ſearcheth after immediately or directly in his ſelf-examination; for Habits (as *Suarez* and others conclude) are not to be felt in themſelves, but onely by their acts. Wee cannot know that we are diſpoſed to love God, but by feeling the ſtirrings of love to him: ſo that it is the act that we muſt directly look for, and thence diſcern the Habit.]

I thought once to let this paſſe; but conſidering it better, I finde that the *Habit*, albeit it be not the *firſt* thing we can hope to finde in our ſelf-examination, yet it is that which we aim at *firſt* in our ſearch: and becauſe we *finde it laſt*, I may conclude, we do *firſt intend* to ſeek it; and indeed, we do in vain ſearch, ſo as to finde any true comfort, unleſſe we diſcover an *Habit*, not onely ſome *acts* of love to God: it is the *frame* and bent of our ſpirit being toward God, that alone renders us Chriſtians, *the renewing of our minde in the inward man*, the *image of God*, the *new creature*; this is that, which til wee diſcover, we have little cauſe to congratulate our ſelves any extraordinary felicitie in the ſinceritie of our grace. Beſides, Grace is an *Habit*, not an *action* properly: and albeit vulgar Chriſtians are not ſo wel verſed in your Metaphyſical Divinitie, as to give an exact account of the *ſtation* that *grace* is to have in the Predicaments, whether in that of *Action* or *Quality*, and cannot over-wel diſtinguiſh *habits* from *faculties*; and have little acquaintance with any but *qualitates patibiles*; yet they generally conceive, that *Grace* is a certain ſtanding *Qualitie*, and that it *continues* with them when they *ceaſe to act*, as when they *ſleep*, during which time they remain *gracious*, though they neither *talk*, nor *walk*, nor *dream* ſure after any *viſible* proportion of grace. So then, This is the *main* thing you ſhould have pleaſed to take into your learned Conſideration: and indeed, however you caſt out this, as it were, to ſhew, you do more then you are bound to, for our ſatisfaction in the preſent Queſtion, yet you are content to oblige us by a ſupernumerary diſcuſſion of this unneceſſary Article: and therefore ſay you,

[2. If any man wil needs put the Queſtion of this *Habitual Grace* onely, though it be not that I ſpeak of principally, yet I anſwer him, That no man doubteth, but that *common grace* containeth good *diſpoſitions*, as *ſpecial grace* containeth *Habits*. Now, who knoweth not, that a *Diſpoſition* and a *Habit* do differ but in *Degree*?]

True, a *Diſpoſition* and *Habit* of the *ſame* ſpecies, differ but in *Degree*; but 1. I hope, a *Diſpoſition* of *one* ſpecies, differs from a *Habit* of *another* ſpecies in ſomwhat more then *Degree*; as a *Whelp* and an old *Dog* of the ſame *kind* differ not *ſpecie*, yet I humbly conceive a Whelp of a *faſting dog* differs from a *full grown Maſtiff*, ſomewhat more then in *Degree*. I uſe this example, though ſomewhat Heterogeneous, as being not unlike thoſe which the ſmall Maſters of the Metaphyſicks, uſually content themſelves to give their Diſciples in this caſe. Do you ſuppoſe that *all* Diſpoſitions and Habits are but *gradually* different? what, is a Diſpoſition of *Fortitude* onely *gradually* different from an Habit of *Temperance*? or a Diſpoſition of *Temperance* onely *gradually* different from an Habit of *Charity*? Let *common Grace* be but a *Diſpoſition*, I deny, it is a *diſpoſition* to the *Habit* of *ſaving Grace*; that *Diſpoſition* and this *Habit* wil appear to be of *different* ſpecies, as are the *acts* iſſuing from them: of which anon.

2. I have learnt, That *Diſpoſitions themſelves* may differ more then in *degree*, no leſs then *in ſpecie*; as two *whelps*, though both be but *whelps* for their *age*, may differ ſomewhat more then in *degree*, though neither of them had the honor (like *Swithin Strowds colt*) to have as much grace as for the *loweſt degree* in any Univerſity. What judg you of a whelp of the ſaid *faſting dog*, and a whelp of the ſaid *Maſtiff*? Certainly, *Burgerſdicius* and *Keckerman* would have ſaid, that a Diſpoſition of *Temperance* differs no leſſe then *ſpecie*, from a Diſpoſition of *Charity*; and ſo a Diſpoſition of *common grace* and a Diſpoſition of *ſaving grace*, may be very wel allowed to differ *ſpecie*, and much more then in *degree*; as by your patience we ſhall ſee by and by; For

3 *Common*

3. *Common Grace* is no way a *diſpoſition* to *ſaving grace* as a *Habit*; and I make it good thus; A *Diſpoſition*, by *acts of the ſame kind* multiplyed, growes into a *Habit* of the *ſame kind*; but no *common grace* ever can be elevated into *ſpecial* and *ſaving grace*, by *any acts of common grace*: *Ergo.* The *Major* is ſuch, as I appeal to all your great Doctors of the Metaphyſicks, for the received Truth of it. The *Minor* I make good thus; If *common grace* may be advanced by *any acts of it* into *ſpecial* and *ſaving grace*, then there may be *ſaving grace* without a *new Creation*: but there can be no *ſaving grace* without a *new Creation*: *Ergo.* The *Minor* (I trow) will be yeilded, *ſaving Grace* being confeſſed to be the *new Creature*: the *Major* I clear thus; What ever may be done by the acts of *common grace*, may be done *without a new Creation*; for *common grace*, I aſſure my ſelfe, will not be ſo preſumptuous as to challenge any ſuch *power* as can reach to ſuch an *act* as *Creation*; therefore if *common grace* may be advanced into *ſpecial* and *ſaving grace*, by acts of its *own* or *within its own ſphere*, there may be *ſaving grace* without a *new Creation.* { Digreſſiõ againſt Mr *Baxter.*

Good Sir, *Common Grace* goes no higher then either the *reſtraining men* from *groſſer ſins*, or the *enabling* them to do their *duties* in reference to *themſelves* or *others* as it becomes them in their *Oeconomical* or *Politick* capacities. It doth not qualifie men to *believe to Salvation*, to *love God ſo as to hate themſelves*; notwithſtanding all *common grace*, men truly *ſeek themſelves*, and *hate God*, and if they conceive they *deny themſelves* and *love God*, this makes them ſtand ſo much the further off from *ſubmitting to the Righteouſneſs of God*, which is the property of *Juſtifying Faith.* Well, but ſay you,

[A carnal man hath a weak inclination to good, and a ſtrong inclination to evil; or if you will ſpeak properly (for the will cannot chuſe evil as evil, but as a ſeeming good) he hath a weak inclination to Spiritual, and Heavenly, Superior good; and a ſtrong inclination to fleſhly, earthly, inferior good; whereupon the ſtronger beats down the weaker: But the Regenerate have ſtronger inclinations to Superiour, Spiritual good, then to inferiour, fleſhly good; and ſo the ſtronger in moſt temptations prevaileth. Now what natural difference is there, but only in degree?]

Surely the Schools of *Pelagius* owe you a Doctorſhip the next Commencement; you ſpeak here like one that had ſate as a very diligent Auditor at the feet of that *Gamaliel*, and were the fitteſt man alive to ſucceed in his Chair.

——*Quis melius magno ſuccedat* Achilli,
Quam per quem Danais, *magnus ſucceſſit* Achilles?

You are here as like him, as if (as we Country men ſay) *you had been ſpit out of his mouth.* [A carnal man (ſay you) hath a weak inclination to good,] and for fear we ſhould think you meant it only of *moral honeſt* good, you give your notion room to expatiate and expreſs it ſelf with more *copia verborum*; [you mean, to *Spiritual* and *Heavenly*, *Superior* good.] I cannot find any one of theſe words in all *Pauls* Epiſtles. He bluntly tells us ever and anon of a certain *carnal part* in every *Spiritual man*; which is *averſe from*; and *adverſe to all* [*Spiritual and Heavenly*, *Superior good.*] But of any *inclination* in a carnal man to it, though never ſo *weak*, he is altogether ſilent. Well, ſeeing we have ſo little hope to learn any thing to this purpoſe from *Paul*, you will give us leave to trouble you with a queſtion or two the more about it.

1. Then, In what *part of a carnal man* doth this [weak inclination to Spiritual and Heavenly, Superior good] uſe to reſide? in his *Underſtanding*? Why φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς, the very choiceſt part of it, is *enmity againſt God*, and it *neither is*, nor *can be ſubject to his Law*, *Rom.* 8.7. Call you this [a weak inclination to Spiritual and Heavenly, Superior good!] Yea, the *natural man*, ψυχικὸς; who of all *carnal men* is like to have the beſt [inclination to Spiritual and Heavenly Superior good,] οὐ δέχεται, *receives not the things of the Spirit of God*, 1 Cor. 2.14

{Digreſſiõ againſt Mr Baxter.} And why? they *are fooliſhneſs unto him*; that argues no [inclination in him to it:] Yea, *Except a man be born again he cannot ſee the Kingdome of God*, Joh. 3. 3. Little of any inclination hitherto: What ſhould I tell you of his being *dead in treſpaſſes and ſins*? and if a *natural man*, which ſounds a man only as *not renewed*, and *cleanſed* by the *Spirit*; what ſhal we think of a *carnal man*, which ſounds a man as over and above, *defiled by the Luſts of the fleſh*, which are apt to muffle the eyes of his underſtanding, though ſufficiently *blind* before? So then, we are like to find no inclination in the carnal mans *underſtanding* to [ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperior good.]

2. Therefore may it pleaſe you, Is this [weak inclination to ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperior good] in his *Will*? Yea, but that is a *blind faculty* where the underſtanding is *beſt ſighted*, and therefore not like to be *inclined* to good, where the underſtanding is *blind* and cannot *diſcern* it. She hath a *cuſtome* to be froward when the *underſtanding* would *lead* her to *ſome good* which ſhe apprehends; ſhe was never ſo *forward* as to *diſcover* any [weak inclination to that good,] whereof ſhe never heard any *report* from the *underſtanding*, yea, which the underſtanding *whiſpered* was *evil*, as ſhe uſeth to defame this [ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperiour good.] So then, we are not like to meet with this *inclination* in the *Will* neither. Whither will you direct us next? Shall we go to the *carnal, earthly, inferior faculties* to enquire for this [weak inclination to ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperiour good?] The *Senſes* ſay, it is not in *them*; the *Affections* may *ſwear* it is not in *them*, they prefer the *pleaſures of the fleſh*, before *ſpiritual joy*; the *profits* of the *earth* before *Heavenly Treaſures*; the worſt of *inferior accommodations*, before *ſuperior good*, and have no [*inclination* to this ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperior good] You may as ſoon diſcover ſuch a weak inclination in *ſome Bruites*, as in *any man*. I remember I ſometimes read a rare Diſcourſe of the *Religion of the dumb Creatures*, which gave us ſome choice pieces of their Letanies, Mattens and Evenſongs, of their *Venite Exultemus*, and their *Te Deum*, *&c.* Thus we have heard of the *Beaſt* and *Birds* [inclination to ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperior good.] But no Doctors beſides thoſe that were Diſciples to *Pelagius*, but have been as mute as *fiſhes* of any ſuch inclinations in *carnal men*; only Mr. *Baxter*, out of his ſtrong affection to theſe [weak inclinations,] tells us emphatically, that they have ſuch an inclination, not only to [*Spiritual*,] but, to carry it higher, [*Heavenly good.*] ſome *Spiritual things* are *earthly, deſcend from Heaven*, but are *exerciſed* about things on *earth*, *I have told you of earthly things* (thoſe ſure were *ſpiritual*) *and ye underſtood not; how will ye if I tell you of heavenly things*? John 3. theſe were ſuch as are *reſerved for Heaven*. Now ſaith Mr. *B.* [A carnal man hath a weak inclination,] not only to *ordinary ſpiritual good*, but to ſuch as we had thought, had laine more remote from his apprehenſion, [*Heavenly good*;] as there are *differences* belike, and *degrees* in Heaven, he is pleaſed to add in an artificial gradation, [ſuperior good,] which is yet more elevated then the [*heavenly good*,] which may move like Mr. *B's* [Vulgar Reader, in a lower Orb,] but even this, which is of the *higheſt rank*, and ſo much the leſſe like to fall under the thoughts of a *carnal man*, is ſo far apprehended and affected by him, that he hath [a weak inclination to ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperior good.]

But now the miſchief is, [He hath withal a ſtrong inclination to fleſhly, earthly, inferiour good, whereupon the ſtronger bears down the weaker.]

That he hath [a ſtrong inclination to fleſhly, earthly, inferiour good] *ſeemingly* ſuch, though *really* it be *evil* unto him, I acknowledge a Truth; and if I ſhould deny it, the woful experience of all ages would too much confirm it to my ſhame; yea, the very name of a *carnal man* is a ſufficient evidence againſt me; a man being ſtiled *Carnal*, only from this ſtrong bent and inclination to this *fleſhly, earthly, inferior* good. But then, if you pleaſe to obſerve it, this [ſtrong inclination to fleſhly, earthly, inferior good,] clearly overthrowes what you ſaid but now, of [a weak inclination to ſpiritual, heavenly and ſuperior good:] for *theſe two* being *contrary* one to another, cannot naturally *meet* in the ſame *ſimple ſubject*. I confeſſe

feſſe, *contrary inclinations* may meet in the *ſame man*, *one* in his *Intellectual part*, *another* in his *Senſitive*; but *contrary inclinations* cannot meet in the *ſame part of a man*: now this [ſtrong inclination to fleſhly, earthly, inferior good,] being in *each* part of a man that is *carnal*, the [weak inclination to ſpiritual, heavenly, ſuperior good] cannot be in *any part* of him. Digreſſion against Mr *Baxter*.

If you reply, Why but ſuch contrary inclinations are found (as I will confeſs) in a *Spiritual man*, in his *intellectual part*, therefore there is nothing hinders, but they may be found in the *Intellectual* part of a *carnal* man, with this difference which you aſſign, That [in a ſpiritual man the inclination to ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperiour good, is the ſtronger; that to the fleſhly and earthly inferiour good, the weaker; but in a *carnal* man, that to ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperior good is the weaker, and that to fleſhly and earthly inferiour good the ſtronger.]

I anſwer, The caſe is different; for this inclination to ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperiour good, is from an *extrinſecal* and *adventitious principle*, and the *inclination* to *fleſhly* and *earthly inferiour* good, from an *intrinſecal* and *native principle*; now this *extrinſecal principle* may well enough produce an *inclination*, *contrary* to that which flowes from the *native principle*, and *both* be entertained in the *ſame ſimple ſubject*; but it is impoſſible that *contrary inclinations* ſhould flow from *one principle*, as there is but one in the *Intellectual part* of a *carnal man*? As we ſee that in water, there may be both *heat* and *cold*; *cold* from its *own form*, *heat* from an *exterior agent*, but of it *ſelf* the water hath only *cold*, not *heat*; and though the *cold* of the *water* be not *ad ſummum*, yet will ſundry Philoſophers tell you, the *cold* is not *abated per adunationem contrarii*, as it is in *mixt* bodies. So it is in a *Regenerate man*, there is both an inclination to *Spiritual*, and an inclination to *fleſhly* good in him, but the inclination to *Spiritual* good, is from the *Spirit of God* making ſuch an impreſſion upon him; in a *carnal* man, there is not, (I trow) any *inclination*, but what is either from his *own principle*, or the *Divels ſuggeſtion* and *motion*, and ſo *none* to *Spiritual good*; and albeit his inclination to fleſhly and earthly inferiour good, be not alwayes *ad ſummum*, yet is not this *remiſſion* of it from the *admixture* of any [weak inclination to ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperior good,] but meerly from the *non-activity* of his *corruption* to the *higheſt point*.

Again, if there be any ſuch [weak inclination to ſpiritual good in a carnal man,] I ask, Whence comes it? from the fleſh it cannot, all *that is born of the fleſh, is fleſh*; *in that dwels no good thing*, much leſs doth any inclination to ſpiritual good, though never ſo weak, come *from it*; it remains therefore, it comes *from the ſanctifying Spirit*, and ſo the *ſanctifying Spirit* ſhall be ſaid to be *in carnal men*, and to *ſanctifie them in part*, though *weakly*. Now, I pray, ſhew me any footſtep for this in Scripture. But if it come from *Nature*, then you make *Nature* the Author of this [*weak inclination to ſpiritual good*,] without being beholding to the *Holy Spirit*; or if you ſay it comes *from the Spirit but in a common way*, you make your *common grace* to be *univerſal*. We call ſome graces *Common*, becauſe they are found in *ſome unregenerate men*, as well as *Regenerate*, and in ſome *unregenerate men*, *more* then in *ſome others* who are *Regenerate*, as more *Moral Vertues* have been found in *ſome Heathens*, then in *ſome Saints*, but not (I wis) becauſe they are found in *all men whatſoever*; as you ſeem to Philoſophize, when you ſay, [A Carnal man hath a weak inclination to ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperiour good;] where the *indefinite*, for ought I can ſee, is equivalent to an *univerſal*.

Now you ask, as it were triumphingly, [What natural difference is there, but only in Degree?]

Yes Sir, 1. There is no ſuch [weak inclination to ſpiritual and heavenly ſuperior good in a carnal man.] 2. Thoſe *common graces* which are ſometimes found in *carnal men*, do differ more then in *degree* from the *ſpecial ſaving graces* in *ſpiritual men*; As different *Natures* may be concluded from the different *operations*

Digreſſio touching Mr Baxter.

which they have on the ſoul, *common graces* turning the point of a mans affections ſtill towards himſelf, ſaving *graces* turning them directly towards *God*, with the *neglect*, yea, *contempt* of a mans *ſelf*; *common graces* being acquirable by the elevating of *reaſon* upon her own *innate principles*; *ſpecial graces* being not acquirable but by expecting to be infuſed by the *Spirit of God*; and even this, though no *convincing* Argument, yet is a *probable* one for their being of a *different kind*: that which *cannot be made* but by the influence of *Heaven*, and that which *can be made* by an *inferiour power*, are certainly *different ſpecieſes*. I grant, things of the ſame ſpecies may be made one by the *immediate hand of Heaven*, another in the *ordinary courſe of Nature*; as *Adam*, and you, and I, though there were ſo great a *difference* in our *making*, were of the *ſame ſpecies*; but things whereof *one cannot be made* but by the *immediate hand of Heaven*, and the *other may* [*by inferior meanes*, are *different in ſpecie*; this that the *one* doth in its *nature*, *exceed* the power of *nature* to produce it, ſhewes it is of a *different nature*, and ſo differs *ſpecie*. In this caſe the *neceſſary requiring* of an *Efficient cauſe* ſo *different*, ſhewes no leſs *difference* in the *nature of it*; and though the *Efficient Cauſe* be *extrinſecal*, yet its *producibleneſs* only by ſuch an *extrinſecal* Cauſe, ſhewes an *intrinſecal* difference in it from other things, which *may be produced* by an *inferiour cauſe*. Shortly, becauſe it is true what you ſaid before from Father *Suarez*, That [*Habits are not to be felt in themſelves, but only by their acts*,] therefore the ſpecifical difference of theſe common graces and ſaving graces will better appear when we come to examine their *Acts*, and in the mean time, I will imitate your charity above, and no further trouble the [Vulgar Reader;] whoſe braines may chance to run a dangerous hazard, in being whirled too long in ſo high an [Orb] as this, of your Metaphyſical ſpeculations.

[The *fourth* thing (ſay you) which we call *ſaving grace* is the *exerciſe*, or *acts* which from theſe *Habits* or *effectual inclinations* do proceed; and this is the *grace* which the ſoul muſt enquire after directly in her ſelf examination. And therefore this is it of which we raiſe the queſtion, Wherein the Truth or ſincerity of it doth conſiſt? Now for theſe *acts of Grace*, who can produce any natural ſpecifick difference between them, when they are ſpecial and ſaving, and when they are common and not ſaving?] Hitherto you but demand in *General*, now you come to *Particulars*.

[Is not *common knowledg* and *ſpecial knowledg*, *common belief* and *ſpecial belief* all *knowledg* and *belief*? And is not *belief* the ſame thing in one and in another, ſuppoſing both to be *real*, though but one *ſaving*? our underſtandings and wills are all Phyſically of the like ſubſtance; and an Act and an Act are accidents of the ſame kind; and we ſuppoſe the Object to be the ſame; common love to God, and ſpecial ſaving love to God, be both Acts of the will.]

I ſhall anſwer Mr. *Baxters* firſt Argumentative queſtion with another of the like faſhion.

Saith he, 1. [Is not common knowledg and ſpecial knowledg, common belief and ſpecial belief, all knowledg and belief; and *ergo*, are they not of the ſame ſpecies?] Is not a *brute Animal* and a *Man Animal*, all *Animal*; a *vegetative animatum*, and a *ſenſitive Animatum* all *animatum*; and *ergo*, are not all theſe of the ſame ſpecies? If Mr. *Subdean* at *Exceſter* Colledg, ſhould preſume to ſay *they were*; we would have him Excommunicated for a dangerous Heretick in Logick, not to be received into the communion of the Hall, till he had humbly ſubmitted to the Statute Pennance of dining on a brick-bat, and a cup of water, to pull down his high genius to the ordinary ſize, that it might not prove too turbulent an Innovator; and, as Doctor *Prideaux* was wont to ſay, bring in new *genus* and *ſpecies*, and afterwards as our old *Chambers*, new *materia prima*.

2. He asketh, and [is not belief the ſame thing in one and another, ſuppoſing both to be real, though but one ſaving?] I ask, And is not Animal the ſame thing in a *Brute* and a *Man*, ſuppoſing both to be really Animals, though but one Rational?

Well

Wel, but 3. Saith he, [Our Understandings and Wils are all physically of the like substance; and an Act, and an Act, are accidents of the same kind; and we suppose the Object to be the same: common love to God, and special saving love to God, be both acts of the Will.] Digressiō touching Mr Baxter.

I here light upon another piece of new Logick: Saith he [1. Our Understandings and Wils are all of the like substance.] They are indeed, as a Cat and a Dog are of the like *understanding*, i. e. none at all; and a Harp and a Harrow of the like *Will*, that is, have none at all. We stil took it, that our Understandings and Wils had been Faculties in the Predicament of *Qualitie*. Let any of *Burgersdicius* and *Keckermans* Scholers be judges, whether we wronged our Understandings and Wils, in placing them below their dignitie in this Categorie of *Qualitie*, whereas they might have challenged a room in that more noble one of *Substance*. Yet let that passe,

2. Saith he, [an Act and an Act are accidents of the same kind.] This same word *kinde* is a kind of impostor, and sometimes goes for *species*, sometimes for *genus*. Now though an Act and an Act be of the same *kinde*, that is, under the same *genus* in the predicament of Action, yet *every act* is not (I trow) of the same *kinde*, that is of the same *species*; no, nor every *act* of the same *faculty*. As for instance, all acts of the *Understanding* and *Will*. Why, but [here wee suppose the *Object* to be the same; Common love to God, and special saving love to God be both acts of the Will.] True, But are they acts of the Wil of the same species? I deny it. For it doth not appear that there is any *true love of God* (you call *common love* such) in the heart of any *unregenerate men*: of all such, as much *love* as they pretend, I may truely say as our Saviour of the Jews, *John* 5.42. *I know you that ye have not the love of God in you.* There are none of them but are at *enmity against* God, therefore cannot *love* him. They *hate* his *Law*, and consequently his *Righteousnesse*; and more, his *Prerogative*, and so indeed his very *Being*: They hate his *Omnipresence*, that he is every where, and present at all their secretest carriages, when they *dig deepest to hide themselves*, if it might be, from him: his *Omniscience*, which renders him privie to their very counsels, yea, all the motions of their thoughts: his *Justice*, which is ready to call them to publick account for all their privatest actings: his *Power*, whereby hee is enabled to execute whatever sentence his Justice shall pass on them: Yea his very *Mercy*, when it is graciously extended to those whom they desperately hate. And in a word, such *Fools* are all *unregenerate* men, that they *say in their heart*, *There is no God*; and such *wretches*, that they wish there were none. Their *common love* of God, as you term it, is terminated at most but in some *Idol*, which they frame to themselves in stead of *God*. God himself is so far from being the *Object* of their *love*, that they hate the very *image* of God, as it is drawn by his own finger in his *Saints*. On the other side, 2. The Saints love God for all those excellencies in him which unregenerate men *hate*, and taking *comfort* in that of God which others *dread*, their *meditation of them* (as *David* professeth) *is sweet*: so that this *common love* (as you stile it) which is found in the *unregenerate*, and that *speciall love* of the *Saints*, have not the same *Object*, and so in that are truly said to be of *different species*. But lastly, when all is done, what is this which you call [*saving love of God?*] I ingenuously confesse, I have not heard of any such love of God in the *Saints*: *saving faith* we use to speak of, as being that whereby wee are *saved*; but where we are said to be saved by *love*, is more then I can think on for the present.

You next proceed to tell us, [That before you proceed further, we must stil distinguish between a Physical or natural specification and a Moral; and remember, that this Question is onely of a Physical difference, which you denie; and not of a Moral, which we make no doubt of.]

But against whom (I pray) do you dispute then, of [all the most highly valued Divines, whose constant judgment (you said) was contrary to yours? I dare be bold to say, there is not one that affirms [a *natural* or *physicall* difference] (as you

{Digreſſiõ againſt Mr Baxter.} you call it) between the acts of common and ſaving grace, in this your ſenſe. You go on, [But we muſt know, that a meer difference in the degrees, in the natural reſpect, doth ordinarily conſtitute a ſpecifical difference in Morality; and the moral good or evil of all our actions, lieth much in the degree; to wit, that they be kept in the mean between the two extreme degrees. And ſo a little anger, and a great deal, and little love to Creatures, and a great deal, though they differ but gradually in their natures; yet they differ ſpecifically in Morality: ſo that *one* may be an *excellent vertue*, and the *other* an *odious vice*.]

Very good; but do you think there is the ſame caſe of *believing* or *loving God*? Can there be an *exceſs* in either of theſe, that ſhould make them degenerate into [*vices*,] and thoſe [*odious*] ones? or is there any ſmall degree of theſe which you dare call by ſuch a name as [Vice?] Is not the *leaſt faith*, though but as a *grain of Muſtard ſeed*, a moſt precious *Pearle*? Dare you tread on the leaſt *ſpark of love to God*? Conſider (I pray) the *exceſs* in theſe actions of [*anger and love to the Creature*,] is that which is eſpecially *vitious*; there can be none ſuch in *faith and love of God*: and therefore theſe are not to be parallell'd as they are by you. If there be any fault to be found in our *faith* and *love of God*, it is only in the *Defect*; and ſuch a fault is to be found in our *greateſt faith and love*, which are ſo far from being in danger of offending in the *exceſs*, that when they are at the *higheſt*, they are juſtly chargeable with *defect*. But however the *leaſt faith and love of God* is *rewarded* by *God*, and the *want* of *more*, is ſwallowed up in that *little* which is *found in us*. God never turned off the *weakeſt Believer*, and *ſmalleſt lover of him*: Nay, which is more, it is evident that there is ſomewhat in the *belief* and *love of the Saints*, though never ſo *ſmall*, which is *more accepted* then *greater belief in others*, and *love*, ſuch as it is; which ſhewes that the *Saints ſmaller faith* and *love* are of a *different kind* from that of *others*, which may ſeem *greater*: As a *little Silver and Gold* is preferred before a far *greater proportion* of *Alchimy*; and why? but that the *Silver* and *Gold* are of a *different kind* of Metal from the *Alchymy*? which makes that a *little of thoſe*, is preferred by *men*, though children may perhaps eſteem more of *this*; and a *little true Diamond* is preferred before a *Corniſh one* which is five times as *great*; and why? but becauſe that though *both* be called *Diamonds* by the *Vulgar*, yet the *Jeweller* knowes that the *Corniſh Diamond* is of a *leſſe noble kind* though it may be of a far *greater magnitude*.

You have not yet done, [Vertue, as vertue (ſay you) conſiſteth not in the bare *nature* of an act.]

No (I wis) it is a *Habit*; nor is any *act* ſaid to be a *vertue* in the *Abſtract*, but only *vertuous* in the *Concrete*; and vertue is oftentimes where there is no *act* of it, as while we *ſleep*, for I ſhall never hear of any man whoſe *vertue* ſhall be ſo *Operative*, as to *work* in his *ſleep*; poſſibly a liberal man may dream of beſtowing gifts on his poor neighbours, as he who was wont to talk in his ſleep of giving fair Doles of Bull beif and Cabbage, but his poor neighbors bellies are as little filled by ſuch bountiful dreams, as his was who dreamt of *eating and drinking*. Vertue then may *oftentimes be* where it doth nor *act*; *ſometimes* where it *cannot act*, as being deſtitute of thoſe *materials whereon*, and *inſtruments whereby* alone it *can act*. As a *liberal* man in a *Wilderneſs*, remote from commerce with men, or in want of Monies, is not in a condition to *act* his *Liberality*. So that this is true beyond all contradiction, [That vertue, as vertue, conſiſteth not in the bare nature of an act,] but as it is *true*, ſo it is *impertinent*.

Well, what followes [But formally it (*viz.* vertue) conſiſteth in the *agreement* or *conformity* of our actions or diſpoſitions to the *Rule* or *Law* (which determineth of their dueneſs) which law or rule preſcribeth the mean or middle degree, and forbiddeth or condemneth both the extreames in degree, where ſuch extreams are poſſible, and we capable of them.]

That [vertue conſiſts in the conformity of our actions or diſpoſitions to the Rule or Law which determineth their dueneſs,] is not ſo properly ſaid. *Righteouſneſs* conſiſts

conſiſts in ſuch conformity of our actions or diſpoſitions to the Law or Rule; but *Vertue* rather conſiſts in the conformity of our actions or diſpoſitions to *certain circumſtances*, which though no *Law* did preſcribe a conformity to them, were to be heeded by us in our *actions*, and though there were no *ſin*, were there no *Law*; yet were there *vertue*, though there were no *Law*; yea, the *vertue* would be more *eminent* in caſe there were *no Law impoſed on us*, but we were only a *Law to our ſelves*. And to this purpoſe it is truly ſaid, that *ſome things* are *commanded* becauſe they are *Juſt*, the *Juſtice* being before the Law, and being the *foundation* of it. {Digreſſiõ againſt Mr *Baxter*.}

I leſs underſtand what you mean, when you ſay, [The Law forbiddeth or condemneth both the extremes in Degree, where they are poſſible, and we capable of them.] For

1. If they be *poſſible*, *we* are *capable* of them; if we be not *capable* of them, they are not *poſſible*; and ſure there is no *vertue*, but that it hath *two extremes*, whereof we are *capable*. Juſtice, it is true, hath but one extreme in *name*, but that *one* extreme in *name*, *Injuſtice*, includes *two* in *nature*; and though both wear the ſame general name of *Injuſtice*; yet this *Injuſtice* is diviſible into *two kinds*, which are one in *exceſs*, as *ſummum jus* is *ſumma injuria*, *minus juſtus* is *injuſtus*; and another in *defect*, as *minus juſtus* is as much *injuſtus*; and he who goes *below*, and he who goes *above* the rate of puniſhment, which is exactly anſwerable to the degree of the offence, doth offend againſt Juſtice. The ſame we ſee in *Vertue*, that it hath but one general oppoſite, *vice*, but that *vice* includes *two* ſpecies, the one in *exceſs* the other in *defect*, both which ſure are *poſſible*, and we *capable* of them. But

2. Though it be thus in *morals*, it is not ſo in *ſpirituals*; for faith hath *no extreme* but *infidelity*; *preſumption* is not an *exceſs* of faith, but clearly a *defect*; for he that *preſumes* upon God, doth not too much *believe* the promiſes of God, but rather thinks God *will do otherwiſe then he promiſeth*; nay, and gives God the *lye*, in expecting God ſhould make good his *promiſe*, without his owne performance of the *condition*, on which alone the *Promiſe* is ſuſpended; and more, that God ſhould not make good his *Threatnings* againſt him for neglecting that *condition*, whereto ſo gracious a *promiſe* of Bleſſings, far beyond the *proportion of the condition* is annexed. The ſame is clear in the *love of God*, in which it is utterly impoſſible that any creature ſhould offend by *exceſs*; ſo that there is in this, an apparent difference between *moral* and *ſpiritual* actions, that thoſe alwayes admit *two extremes* which are *poſſible*, and we *capable* of them, but *ſpiritual* actions admit but one at the moſt; yea, where the *action* is *performed*, there is no ſuch *peccant defect* in the *ſmalneſs* of the action; but that the very *ſmalleſt degree* hath a juſt title to *gracious*, and accordingly finds *acceptance* with God; yea, which is more, *his greater goodneſs to us*, is many times moſt eminently magnified in *our leſſer performances*. So that though you conclude very rightly, That there is a very great moral difference (ſuch as may be termed ſpecifick) between thoſe acts which only do differ in degree; yet is it not true, that there is ſuch a difference between *acts* of *faith* and *Love of God* differing in *degree*. When you ſay, [A moral ſpecifical difference is uſually founded in a natural gradual difference,] It is true only of meer *moral* actions, not ſuch as we ſpeak of, which are *ſpiritual*; and this ſhewes that *ſpiritual actions*, ſuch as are found in the *Saints*, differ *ſpecie* from what ever actions are found in men *unregenerate*.

[Having thus explained my meaning, the clearing of all this to you and fuller confirmation, will be beſt diſpatched theſe three wayes. SECT. 13.

1. By exemplifying in each particular Grace, and trying this Rule upon them ſeverally.

2. By examining ſome of the moſt ordinary marks which have been hitherto delivered, and Chriſtians uſe to take comfort in.

3. By enquiring what Scripture ſaith in the Point. And after theſe I ſhall anſwer the Objections that are againſt it, and then ſhew the uſefulneſs and neceſſity of it, and danger of the contrary.

1. The

Digreſſiõ againſt Mr *Baxter*.

1 The Graces of the ſpirit in mans ſoul are either in the Underſtanding, or in the Wil and Affections. Thoſe in the Underſtanding, as Knowledge, Prudence, Aſſent to Gods Word, called Faith, &c. I make no queſtion, are as truly Graces, and as proper to the Saints, as thoſe in the Will and Affections. But though grace be in both Faculties, as they are called; yet is it certainly diſcernable onely in the Will, and not in the Underſtanding: for all acts that are meerly in the Underſtanding, are but imperfectly vertuous, being but preparatorie and introductorie to the Wil, where they are digeſted and perfected, as I ſaid before. Dr *Stoughtons* words are theſe; " As for my part, I could never comprehend " that which Divines have gone about, to be able to put a characteriſtical diffe- " rence in the nature of Knowledge; that a man may be able to ſay, ſuch a know- " ledg is, and ſuch a knowledg is not a ſaving knowledg: but onely (as I uſe to " expreſſe it) as the Sun is the greater light, but the Moon hath greater influence " on wateriſh bodies: So knowledg, let it be what it wil, if it be good and ſa- " ving, it hath an influence on the ſoul. There may be a great deal of knowledg " which is not vital and practical, which carrieth not the heart and affections a- " long with it, and they that have it have not ſaving knowledg. But they that " have the leaſt degree of knowledg, ſo it be ſuch as hath an influence to draw the " heart and affections along with it, to love God, and obey God, it is ſolid and " ſaving knowledg. So Dr. *Stoughton* in his *Righteous mans plea to Happineſs*, *p.*38, 39. And for my part, I know no mark drawn from the meer nature of Knowledg, or Beleef, or any meer intellectual act, by which wee may diſcern it from that which may be in an unholy perſon.]

Had you ſaid but this, there ſhould have been no difference between you and me, I yeeld you, that where-ever the *Underſtanding* or *Will* is ſanctified, *both* are ſanctified, and that *ſpecial grace* is ſituated in both Faculties; for ſo I perceive I may have your leave to call them, whatever you conceive of them; yea, I wil go ſo far with you, as to grant you, that [grace is certainly diſcernable onely in the Wil, not in the Underſtanding.] But yet I muſt be bold to tel you, that though no mans grace for the *particular* of it, be certainly diſcernable but in the *Will*, yet in *general*, grace in the *Underſtanding*, or that *Knowledg* which we call *ſanctifying*, is certainly diſtinguiſhable from that which is not *ſanctifying*: and in particular, the operation which *one* hath upon the *Will*, doth manifeſtly evince the *nature* of it in the *Underſtanding* to be different from that of the *other*: For howbeit *different forms* cannot be known *immediately*, but we muſt have recourſe to their *different* operations for the knowledg of their *difference*; yet the *difference* of their *operations*, I mean *ſpecificall*, doth irrefragably evince a *difference* in the *forms*. The *form* is (as I may ſay) more *reſerved*, and doth not ſhew its *face* to us, we diſcover it onely by its *footſteps*. I pray, what think you of the *forms* of *Fire*, *Air*, and *Water*? what characters can your ſubtiltie give us, whereby to diſtinguiſh them one from another? Are we not fain to be beholding to thoſe *Qualities* which emane from them, for acquainting us with their *difference*? Yea, what judg you of thoſe very *Qualities* whereby we are led to apprehend the *difference* of theſe *forms*? Are we not conducted by the *effects* which they have upon *other bodies*, to the knowledg of them? We cannot feel the *heat* of the *fire*, but by a heat wrought *by* the *fire* in *another* bodie. Were *fire*, for inſtance, *in vacuo*, it could not *heat*, and conſequently, not be *known to be hot*, and conſequently not known to *differ* from *Water*. We can make no ſuch neer approach to the *form* of any Element, as to diſcern it, but by the *qualities* which emane from it in that *Element*: nor can wee get any ſuch familiaritie with thoſe *qualities* in any *Element*, but by the mediation of the *like*, which it imprints on ſome other *adjacent bodie*: Yet thus we certainly conclude a *difference* in the *forms* of the Elements, from their *effects* on other *bodies*; an *intrinſecal difference* in the *forms*, from the *different extrinſecal effects*.

And thus to apply this to our preſent Buſineſs; be it true, we cannot certainly diſtinguiſh between ſanctifying knowledge, and ſuch as is not ſuch, otherwiſe then

then by the *influence* the *one* hath, and not the *other* upon the *Will*. Yet from this *different influence* which they have on the *will*, we rationally infer, they have an *answerable difference* in *themselves*, and that they differ in their *nature*, as they are found in the *understanding*, no less then they do in their *operations* evidenced in the *will*. Digressiō against Mr Baxter.

Nor can I discern how Doctor *Stoughton* doth in the least measure contradict this difference of *sanctifying* or *saving knowledge* in *it self* from that which is *not sanctifying* or *saving*; it is his modesty to say, [he could never comprehend that which Divines have gone about, to be able to put a Characteristical difference in the nature of them.] He doth not say, there is no *such difference in the nature of them*; nor doth he *blame others* for going about to be *able to put it*. He doth not, as Mr. *Baxter*, contradict [all the Divines which he most highly values] in this point: nay, the instance which he gives, (and it is a very fine one) shewes that he conceived there is *such a difference* in the *nature* of *sanctifying* or *saving knowledg*, and that which is not such, though his ingenuity confess, [he could not comprehend what it is,] for surely the *light* of the *Sun* and *Moon* are of a *different nature*; the *different*, yea, *contrary effects* which that of the Moon hath on wateriſh bodies, evinceth it beyond contradiction; the *Sun drieth up*, the *Moon* makes them *greater*: and albeit it may be said, that that different effect on wateriſh bodies, is not from the *light* of the Sun and of the Moon, as *light*, yet it is from it as the *light* of the *Sun* and *Moon*. And so as the *light of the Moon* it differs in its *nature* from the *light of the Sun*: *Light* is a *general notion*, the *light* of the *Sun* and *Moon* a *special one*. *Knowledg* is of a *general notion*, *sanctifying knowledge*, and *not sanctifying knowledge* of a special one. Well, let me try what my meanness can do to discover a *difference* in the nature of *sanctifying* knowledge from that which is *not sanctifying*.

1. Then for the *quod sit*, 1. If the *one* have somewhat in it which is *apt* to *work*, and accordingly *doth work* upon the *will* where the other doth not, it is clear the *one* differs from the *other*, and that in the *very nature of it*; for a *less measure* of *sanctifying knowledge* is apt to have, and accordingly hath *such an influence* on the *will*; whereas a *greater measure* of the *other* hath *not*; therefore it is not from the *measure*, but the very *nature* of this knowledge that this *effect* on the *will* so happily proceeds. I acknowledg that *sanctifying knowledg in the highest degree*, is not of it self able to operate so sufficiently on the *will*, but that there is need of *another kind of Grace* immediately wrought in the *will* to make it produce such an effect. for that the *will* having a power *not to follow* the ultimate dictate of the *understanding*, but to hold off in *suspence*; there is no *knowledge* in the *understanding*, but unless it be assisted with *Grace* in the *will*, will fall short of begetting such a compliance in the *will*, with the dictate of the *understanding*. *Video meliora proboque, non sequor*, though perhaps *non deteriora sequor*. But then againe, no grace in the *will* is able to lead it to will that which is good and acceptable in the sight of God without *sanctifying knowledge* in the *understanding*, which is that which must *lead* the *will*, it being a *blind faculty* when at best; so that sanctifying knowledge hath an influence on the *will*, so as to induce or incline it to do *that which is good and acceptable in the sight of God*, which *knowledge not sanctifying*, hath not.

2. If the *one* have somewhat in it which is apt to produce effects in the *understanding* and *will*, *contrary* to those which the *other* doth, then is it clearer that the *one* is of a *different nature* from the *other*; but this is true, that one knowledg, such as is *sanctifying* or *saving*, is apt to produce *contrary effects* both in the *understanding* and *will*, to that which the *other*, *not sanctifying* doth; *ergo*. The *Major* is beyond all possibility of contradiction. The *Minor* I make good thus:

That *knowledge* which is *sanctifying*, is apt to make men have *low thoughts of themselves*, and *charitable affections* to *others*; but the *other knowledge* is as apt to *puffe men* up with high thoughts of *themselves*, and to make them *supercilious* and *surly* towards *others*; and the more of *sanctifying knowledg* men have, still

 propor-

Digreſſiõ againſt Mr Baxter.

proportionably the *lower thoughts* they have of *themſelves*, and the more *charitable affections* to *others*: but contrariwiſe, the more of *other knowledge* men attaine to, the more they ſwell in their *opinions of themſelves*, and the more they ſlight and *contemne others*: the one is as *leaven*, the other is as *ſalt*.

2. For the *quid ſit*: The knowledge which we call *Sanctifying*, is a knowledge of the *Excellency of Chriſt above all things in the world*, founded on an *experience* of the utter *inſufficiency* of *all other things* which ſeem to *promiſe* moſt happineſs to a man, to contribute any thing conſiderable to ſuch an *effect*; what ever knowledge is not founded on ſuch an *experience* is not *Sanctifying*. So that here is 1. An *experience of the inſufficiency of all other things* to do this work, which ariſeth from hence; men having read the *Indictment* drawen up againſt them by their *conſciences*, have received the *ſentence* of death for *every* one of their ſins, and more eſpecially for ſuch as their conſciences have repreſented more at large, and with ſad hearts expected the *execution* of it, and in the meane time though they have been *repreived*, they have found no *mitigation* of their woe, from all the accommodations the world could afford them; all their *Wealth* not able to buy them one dayes *reſt*; all the things which others call *ſports* and *paſtimes*, not able to afford them one hearty *laugh*; all the *applauſes* and *acclamations* of other men, not able to induce them to any *better conceit of themſelves*, but rather in the midſt of thoſe *miſerable comforts* they have pined away with the more *ſecret anguiſh*, and have found all theſe ſorry remedies have been apt to *inflame* the heat in their boſomes, in ſtead of *quenching* it; nay, they have *thought on God*, and been more *troubled*; thoſe *Excellencies* that are in him, his *Omniſcience*, *Omnipotence*, *Juſtice*, *Faithfulneſs*, yea, his *Mercy*, as far as they could diſcover theſe in his Works or Words, being all of dreadful import to them, and cauſing them to languiſh in a kind of deſpair of being ever the better for this goodneſs of his; yea, apprehending that the *better* he is in *himſelf*, the *worſe* it will go with *them*; and after all this fearful waiting for ſad things, have diſcovered a *door of hope opened* unto them in the *ſide of Jeſus Chriſt*, and have received an unutterable eaſing of their ſpirits, and raviſhing of their hearts upon the ſweet conſideration of the *pretious* and *invaluable Promiſes* which God hath made to all *laden*, *drooping*, *fainting*, *broken* ſinners, and thereby been rowzed up to *ſearch further* into that *Myſtery*, and upon the ſearch have forgotten their *former ſorrowes*; and the further they have enquired, the more they have ſeen cauſe to *hate ſin*, to *bleſs God* for his ineſtimable *love in Jeſus Chriſt*, to *overlook the world*, to *long* for opportunities to *ſerve Chriſt* on earth, and to *wait* for a happy tranſlation to heaven, there to *raign* with him to all eternity.

My meaning is not, that *all ſanctifying knowledg* is founded in ſo *deep a ſenſe* of a mans *miſery* by reaſon of *ſin*, and the *wrath of God* lying upon him, and his *happineſs* by this *Reconciliation purchaſed* by *Chriſt*; for that the *depth of this ſenſe* is a *degree* of experience, not the *Eſſence* of it, and accordingly as a mans *ſenſe* of theſe is *greater* or *leſs*, ſo his is *experience more* or *leſs*; but *all ſanctifying knowledge* is founded in a *ſenſe of ſo deep a miſery*, and ſo *high a happineſs*; without which I may truly and ſafely affirm, there is *no ſanctifying knowledg*; but that indeed *all ſanctifying* and *ſaving knowledg* is *experimental*, and in *this* diſtinguiſhed from that which is *not ſuch*.

But ſaith Mr. *Baxter*, [If any ſay, That ſaving knowledge is experimental, and other is not; I anſwer;] hee ſhould ſay rather, I oppoſe [three things.

1. Of *matters of faith* we have *no experience*, as that *Chriſt is the ſecond Perſon*, *was incarnate*, *crucified*, *buried*, *roſe again*, *&c.*

2. Of *common practicals* *wicked men have experience*, as that the *world is deceitful*, that *man is prone to ſin*, that *Satan muſt be reſiſted*, *&c.*

3. For thoſe *other ſpecial internal experiences*, which denominate a Chriſtians knowledg *experimental*, the mark of ſincerity lyeth in the *experienced thing it ſelf*, rather

rather then the *knowledg of it*: for example, A Christian knowes experimentally what the *new birth is*, what it is to *have God*, to *delight in him*, &c. Now the Mark lieth not properly in his *knowledg of these*, but in that *love, delight* and *renovation*, which he *possesseth*, and so *knoweth*.] Digressiō against Mr Baxter.

I answer to the first, That it is true, that of these matters of faith which you mention we have *no experience*, as for the *quod sit* of them, That *Christ is the second Person, was Incarnate*, &c. but as for the *cur sit* of them, we have; *i.e.* we have experience of the *necessity* of them, of the *benefit* that redounds to us by them; and *this* is the *experience* which I insist on, as the mark whereby sanctifying and saving knowledge is distinguished from that which is not such. As for instance,

1. We have *experience* of our lying *under such wrath of God, as that nothing could deliver us from it less then Christ*, the second Person his being Incarnate, crucified, buried, and his rising again, &c. 1. None could have made *satisfaction* for our sins whereby we had made our selves enemies to God, but the *Son of God*. What *Creature* could have presumed to interpose in the behalf of an *enemy to God*; that he should be reconciled to him, *without satisfaction*? And what *satisfaction* could be given by *all the Creatures* in earth or Heaven? 2. The *Son of God* could not have made *satisfaction* without *suffering*, nor by *any suffering* but *death*; *death*, and that *eternal*, being due to *every enemy to God*. 3. The *Son of God* could not *suffer*, but he must first be *Incarnate*. 4. It could not have *appeared*, that he who was Incarnate, crucified and buried, had been the *Son of God*, if he had not *rose again*; and as to our *comfort*, *Idem est non esse & non apparere*. So that we may very well be allowed to say we have *experience* of the *necessity* of *all these particulars* that they should be.

2. We have *experience* of *benefit* redounding to us by *all these* in the sense, 1. of the *peace* we have with God, through the *blood of his Sons Cross*. And 2. of the *Comfort* we take in all the *troubles of our lives*, in a reflection on the *smalness* of them in comparison of those which the *Son of God* was pleased to undergo in the dayes of his flesh, who *when he was rich*, beyond all that can be imagined, *became poor*, beyond all the poverty we can complain of, *that we through his poverty should be made rich*. And 3. of the *fearlessness* we have of *death*, which Christs precious *death* and burial bereaved of its *sting*, and made it no other then a *sleep* to his servants, who have a pledg of the Resurrection of *their bodies* in the Resurrection of *Christs Body*, to whose *glorious Body* these our *vile bodies* shall be as surely made like hereafter, as he heretofore was found in the *likeness of our flesh*; and that *he was made in all things like unto us, yet without sin*, so we shall be made *like unto him* even in this, that *we shall be without sin*; and that as he, the *God of the spirits of all flesh*, took our *flesh*, so our *fleshly bodies* shall be made *spiritual*, as much as for the present our very souls are too *carnal*.

Thus even these particulars, in regard of the undeniable *necessity* we have of them, and the incomparable advantage we gain by them, do clearly fall under the *experience* of Christians.

To the second I grant, [Wicked men have experience of those common practicals (as you call them) that *the world is deceitful*, that *man is prone to sin*, that *Sin as must be resisted*.] But how well you call all these *practicals*, is more then I understand. That the *world is deceitful*, so as to frustrate our *hopes* when they are at best, is a principle which should lead us off from devoting our selves to the world, and this non-devoting our selves to the world, is matter of *practice*; but that the *world is deceitful*, is not therefore a *practical principle*; for as well you may say, that *God is true*, is a *practical principle*, because it should lead us to devote our selves to God; but notwithstanding, these principles have such an *influence* on our *practise*, is *neither*, by your leave, a *practical principle*. The same may be said of the next, that *man is prone to sin*, it should lead us to watch over our selves, and this is *practical*; it followes not, that therefore *that man is prone to sin* is such a *practical principle*, no more then that *God is the avenger of sin*,

{Digreſſiõ against Mr Baxter.}

is a *practical principle*, albeit it be apt to ſcare men from committing of ſin.

That *Satan muſt be reſiſted*, is indeed a practical principle; but what *experience* wicked men have of it, I know not; I am ſure their *practice* ſpeaks very little of their *experience* in this particular. I wis, when they *reſiſt* him *moſt*, they *comply* with him *more*. They have little *experience* of *Satans aſſaults*, and therefore much leſs how they are to *reſiſt* him.

Again, Such experience as this of theſe *practicals*, as you call them, falls not within compaſs of that which we mean by *ſaving knowledge*, without this *experience* there can indeed be no *ſanctifying knowledge*, yet this *experience* is not ſuch as is *ſanctifying*.

Laſtly, The *experience* which the *Saints* have of theſe *practicals*, is of another nature from that of *Wicked men*. Wicked men have experience that the *world is deceitful*, ſo as to draw them into *danger*; not that it is *deceitful* in drawing them into *ſin*; yea, the world (they think) gives them very good and wholſome advice, when it ſhewes them a way how to make any advantage to *themſelves* by ſinning againſt *God*, or rather how it takes them handſomely off from the thought of God, which would hinder them in their prudent proſecutions of their deſignes.

To the third you ſay, of [thoſe other ſpecial internal experiences, which denominate a Chriſtians knowledge experimental, the mark of ſincerity, lieth in the experienced thing it ſelf, rather then in the knowledge of it: For example, A Chriſtian knowes experimentally what the new birth is, what it is to love God, to delight in him, *&c.* Now the mark lyeth not properly in this knowledge of theſe, but in that love, delight, and renovation which he poſſeſſeth, and ſo knowes.]

I anſwer, That this is not the only thing which denominates a Chriſtians *knowledge experimental*, not that which we mean when we ſpeak of *ſanctifying* and *ſaving knowledge*; for this you ſpeak of, is ſuch an *act*, as ſuppoſeth a man *ſanctified*; now we enquire of *that act* of the *underſtanding*, which conduceth to *ſanctification*; and this is rather a *ſenſe* of the *neceſſity* of *renovation*, then a *ſenſe of enjoying* it; a *ſenſe* of *our hatred* of God by *nature*, and *Gods wrath* falling neceſſarily on *us*, unleſs *prevented by Chriſt*; a ſenſe of our *delighting in other things* to our *undoing*, and not in God who alone is worthy to be *delighted* in for *himſelf*. It lyes in an *experience* of our *miſery without Chriſt*, and that none but *he* can deliver us, and an *apprehenſion* of the happy *eaſe* we ſhall have of our *burthen* by caſting it on Chriſt; or at moſt of an *eaſe* we have by caſting it on him, which though I confeſs it be an *effect* of the *ſanctifying Spirit*, yet is not *formally Sanctification*, as which lies rather in a *purging the filthineſs of our ſins out of our ſelves*, then a *devolving* the *burthen of them upon Chriſt*. So that the *Objects* of thoſe *Experiences* are *different*, and conſequently the *nature* of them, and ſo for ought hath been ſaid yet to the contrary, there is a *ſpecifick difference* between that *knowledg* which is *ſanctifying*, and that which is not, not only a *gradual difference*, as Mr. *Baxter* contends.

When he ſaith, [The mark lieth not properly in a Chriſtians knowledg of theſe, but in that love, delight and renovation which he enjoyeth.] It is true, the mark *of his ſincerity* lies in thoſe, that they be ſincere; but wherein doth the mark of their ſincerity lye? But this that we enquire after is *his knowledg*, which I do not underſtand how well any man can call *ſincere*: *Sincere* it may be *virtually* as *effecting* ſincerity; ſurely no *knowledg* is *formally ſincere*, unleſs *ſincerity* be taken in an *unuſual* ſenſe.

——*Ne pars ſincera trahatur*
Vas niſi ſincerum eſt quodcunq; infundis acceſcit.

The *truth* of *ſaving knowledg* is a fitter expreſſion then the *ſincerity* of it. Since-

rity

rity is properly said of *those acts* which are of the *will*, not of those of the *mind*; its seat is not in the *head*, but the *heart*; but these are *minutiæ*, I forbear to prosecute them. {Digression against Mr Baxter.}

That that I have endeavoured, is to shew, that *sanctifying knowledg differs from that which is not sanctifying* (and such as is found in men unregenerate) *more then gradually*, for that it is conversant about a distinct object. Now whereas you have already told us upon the by, [That no doubt a wicked man may know and believe every particular Truth which a Christian doth believe,] and fall upon it again hereafter, I hold it fit to examine this apart.

And 1. I must oppose; That if [a wicked man may know and believe every particular Truth which a Christian doth,] Then a wicked man may have the *Spirit of God*, the man *continuing wicked*; for no man can say, that is, from his heart, as believing it, *That Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost*, 1 Corinth. 12. 3. When you say, [If any man deny it, let him name me one.] I name this, and I humbly conceive by warrant of no worse Author then blessed *Paul*.

[Some learned men you have heard affirm, that no wicked man can believe Scripture to be the Word of God.] But say you, [That is a fancy that (you think) needs no confutation, the Divels believe it no doubt.] Again, say you, [Some will say, That no wicked man can believe the pardon of his own sins, or assent to the truth of this Axiome, *My sins are pardoned*.] And you say, [So many have harped on this string, that you are ashamed that the Papists should read it in their writings, and thereby have that occasion of hardning them in their errors, and of insulting over the Reformed Doctrine.] I shall consider each of these apart.

As to the first, [To *believe the Scripture is the Word of God*,] is I think more then any wicked man attains to. The Divels, though they *know* it to be the Word of God, yet are no where said to *believe* it: the Divels indeed are said to *believe* that there is *one God*, *James* 2. 19. No where are they said to *believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God*: nay, when they are said to *believe* that there is *one God*, *belief* is to be taken at large for *assent*, for else I know not how you can evidence it to me, that they *believe* there is but *one God*, because God saith so in his Word; nay, this is a point which must be assented to before *any belief* to his Word. For as it is *necessary* before I *believe* what God saith is *true*, that I bee convinced *God is*; so it is as *necessary*, that if I be convinced that *God is*, I be convinced that God is *one*, it being *impossible* that there should be *two Gods*, as may appear by the light of Reason, and of course all Polytheists were Atheists. Besides, the Apostle *James* in the Text before us, speaks only by way of *Redargution* of a man *pretending to faith*, because he *believed there is one God*: Now saith the Apostle, to shew the *vanity* of such a *pretence*, the *Divels also believe*; *viz.* in *thy* sense of *believing*, not in *mine*; they *assent* to this Truth which thou calleſt *believing*, though indeed it be *not such*, and may appear *not to be such*, because it is found in the *Divels*. So that here the Apostle speaks rather *ad hominem*, and according to the apprehension which the *pretender to faith* had of *believing*; then according to his *own* thoughts of *believing*. As if in case a lewd man should vapour to me in these words, *I am a constant attendant on the Ordinances, I go to Church every Sunday*; and I should answer him, *You do well, so doth your Dog, and doth not sleep there*; he that should have inferred, I honoured the Dog so far as to acknowledge him a constant Attendant on the Ordinances in *my own sense*, because I avouch him such in the *civil mans sense*, should put such a conclusion upon me, as I trust you conceive I had as little *Reason* as the *Dog*, as well as the *Dog* had as much *Religion*, as his *Master*, if I should yeild to own it.

Further. Though the Divel assent to this, *that there is one God*, I know not how you can clear it, that they as much as *assent* to this, that the *Scriptures are the Word of God*. 1. God hath not told them they do. 2. If any man do, I shall ask him, Whether he have this from God, or good Angels, or the Divel? He will

not

{Digressiō against Mr Baxter.} not be able to shew the testimony of either *God*, or good *Angels*; and if he do produce the *Divels* own testimonie, though (I confesse) *that* would make much against the *Divel*, yet would it make little for *him*, the Divel not being so *honest*, as that we should give any credit to his *word*; and he is so *cunning*, that though in this case his *word* seem to be against his *interest*, yet wee may well suspect hee hath some deep fetch in it, for his advantage, both against God and Man.

But still onwards, there is not the same reason for the *Divels*, and a *wicked mans assent* to this truth, that the *Scripture is the word of God*. The Divel by his *experience* hath found the Scripture in all ages maintained by God as *his word*, and so may very easily assent to this truth, that the *Scripture is his word*; but a *wicked man* falls short of the *Divell* in this particular, and hath not had any considerable part of his *experience*, and so not like ground for such an *assent*.

Yea, a *wicked man* not having such *experience* of Gods asserting the Scripture to be his Word, hath many *jealousies* that it is but the *word of man*, and there are *some things* in it which are not agreeable to the apprehensions he hath of God, and so he looks on the *main* matter of the Scripture (*Christ crucified*) as *foolishnesse*, 1 *Cor.* 1. It is true, a wicked man may assent to this truth, that the *Scripture is the Word of God* upon some *such considerations* as Mr *Goodwin* and you have furnished the world with; but if he assent to this Truth upon *any considerations*, so as to lay them for the *ground* of his assent, I deny that he *believes* it; for *belief* is an assent founded upon the *sole authority of God*, and in that characteristical point differs from all other *assents*.

Lastly, I professe to be of the same mind with my old great Master, the learned *Prideaux*, that this is the *primo creditum*, that the *Scriptures are the Word of God*; and that, albeit our assent to this Truth, do admit of *corroboration* by variety of sundry *subsequent considerations*; yet that it is *first implanted in us* by the *immediate inspiration* of the Holy Ghost, For if you please to observe it, How shall I believe that the Scripture is the word of God by Divine faith, but for the *testimony of God*? Now this *testimony of God of the Scriptures*, must either be *in the Scriptures*, or *without them*: if *in the Scriptures*, then I must *believe the Scriptures*, because *in the Scriptures* it is said they are the *Word of God*; but that supposeth, I believe the Scriptures to be the *Word of God*, before I *meet* with such a *testimony* whereon to *build my belief*. It remaines therefore, my *faith* is founded on a *testimony without it*; What is that? in the *Church*. How come I to believe the *Church* to be the *Church* of God but by the *Scriptures*? therefore *that* is not *first*, but the *witness of God to my spirit* is the first ground on which my *belief is built*; and this is by a *secret framing of my heart* to *assent* to this Truth, *Est quadam veritas quæ ducit sine Ratione*.

Did wicked men *believe the Scripture to be the Word of God*, it were impossible they should *continue wicked*. I rather conceive, they have no *assent* at all to this Truth: probably they may have some *apprehensions* now and then by *fits*, that it *may be the Word of God*; that it is so, they have given us no demonstrations that they believe it; nay, which is more, did they *believe it for Gods Authority*, they could never *disbelieve it*; that *Authority of God* being that which would answer all *Objections* whatsoever against it. Now to the second,

[Some will say (saith Mr. *Baxter*) that *no wicked man can believe the pardon of his own sins*, or assent to the truth of this Axiom, *My sins are pardoned*. To this (saith Mr. *Baxter*) I answer,

[1. By way of Concession, no wicked man *in sensu composito*, can believe for the pardon of sin, or hath such a *faith*, as *pardon is promised to*: but that they may believe that their *sins are pardoned*, and seriously believe it, did not Error make it necessary, he should be ashamed to bestow any words to prove it.]

But say I, it is as impossible a wicked man should believe *that his sins are pardoned*, as that he should believe *for* the pardon of his sins. For

1. All belief being grounded on *Gods testimony*, unless God have given a *testimony*,

mony, that *his ſins are pardoned*, he cannot *believe* it; well he may *conceit* it, yea, be *confident* of it; but that amounteth not to *belief*. *Confidence* in reſpect of the *Etymon* of the Word ſounds *belief*, but in regard of the *uſe*, it is applied to any *ſtrong apprehenſion* which a man is poſſeſt with, though it be ſo little related to belief, that they may *marry*, as we ſay, without being beholding to a *diſpenſation*. Digreſſiõ againſt Mr Baxter.

2. *Faith for pardon of ſins*, is neceſſarily required to *faith that ſins are pardoned*. Now if it be true, as without all diſpute it is, that a *wicked man cannot believe* (as Mr *Baxter* ſaith) *for pardon of ſins*, then neither can he believe that *his ſins are pardoned*; the belief *for* pardon is a *direct act*, and muſt go *firſt* to make way for *belief that his ſins are pardoned*; which is a *reflex* act, and cannot be admitted, till the *direct* act have prepared the ſoul to receive it.

Well now to Mr. *Baxters* Reaſons, whereby he irrefragably proves that a *wicked man may believe his ſins are pardoned*.

[1. A wicked man may in his judgment, without any great difficulty, believe an untruth, eſpecially which he would fain have to be true, though every untruth he cannot believe; but this is an untruth to every wicked man, that *his ſins are pardoned*, (for even by the Antinomians confeſſion, it is untrue of all wicked men not elected;) and an untruth, which he would fain have to be true: for what man is ſo perverſe in his fancies, as to doubt whether a wicked man would have his ſins pardoned? therefore he may believe it.]

1. I wonder not at any thing Mr. *Baxter* attempts in this kind, when he ſo ſolemnly produceth the *untruth* of this Propoſition, a *wicked mans ſins are pardoned* as a *prime part* of an *Argument*, to prove he *may believe it*. Had he ſaid, though it *be not true*, yet becauſe a wicked man would fain *have it true*, that *his ſins are pardoned*; therefore it is poſſible he may *believe that his ſins are pardoned*, the *falſeneſs* of it notwithſtanding; and ſo ſuſpended the weight of his Ratiocination on the wicked mans *deſire*, it had been more paſſable; but to hang it upon the untruth of this Propoſition, is an Argument only of the rare dexterity of Mr. *B's* invention, which can prove *quidlibet ex quolibet*. But

2. How doth a wicked mans *deſire* that his ſins were pardoned, prove that he believes, yea, or conceits in any kind his *ſins are pardoned*? Why for this, we are to take it up upon the Authority of that great Doctor of the Church St. *Seneca*, *quod nimium volumus miſeri, facile credimus*; but I conceive this paſſage of the holy *Tragœdian* may be called into queſtion by me, without any danger of my being called into queſtion for an undervaluer of the Fathers. But

1. I find that *miſeri*, are *leſs apt to believe*, what they would fain have to be *true*, then thoſe that are *merry*; at leaſt all the *miſeri* that I have been acquainted with, uſe to give nothing ſo much *credit* to the falſe reports that are calculated to their *deſires*, as the *merry grigs* who were ready to believe the *relation* of the Dutch mens deſign to ſquirt the Thames into Cheapſide, and ſo to drowne the City; and that of the expedition of the Army, which came three months ſince in a cloud out of *Scotland*, and ſuddenly ſurprized *Newcaſtle*, though they ſtaid ſo little while there, as if their Errand had been rather to fetch *fire*, then *coales*.

2. I do not find that any are ſo apt to believe what they *would have*, as what they *would not have to be true*, unleſs it be ſuch wiſe men as *Solomons* ſimplicians: who (I confeſs) were cozen Germanes to the ſinners before us. for fear is of a quicker ſent then hope; and being melancholly, is ingeniouſly jealous, and can find probabilities for any thing that *tends to its danger*; whereas hope hath a touch of ſuſpicion (on the other ſide) of every thing that promiſeth beſt *advantage*.

Res eſt ſolliciti plena timoris amor.

3. I cannot learn that *any wicked mans deſire*, that *there were no God*, made him *ordinarily believe* that there is *none*, which yet is of an untruth, all as grateful to him as this, *that his ſins are pardoned*.

4. Shortly

Digreſſiõ againſt Mr Baxter.

4. Shortly, I conceive, if his deſires, that a *falſe Propoſition* were *true*, were ſo ſufficient to make him *believe it true*, he would rather believe that his *ſin* is *no ſin*, that there is no *ſuch thing* as *Hell*, no *Judgment*, and many like *untruths*, which it would be of great concernment to him to have *true*; and if *wiſhing* would do it, he would *believe* them to be true, and ſo eaſe himſelfe of all thoſe *fits* and *qualmes* upon his Spirit, with which the noyſe of thoſe harſh things of *Hell* and *Judgment*, do now and then a little diſquiet and moleſt him. But

5. I pray let me view this Argument better in its beſt clothes of a Syllogiſtical cut then thus, This that his ſins are pardoned, is an untruth which a wicked man would fain have to be true: But a wicked man may believe an untruth which he would faine have to be true; *Ergo*, he may believe this, that his ſins are pardoned. 1. Is this untruth in the Minor univerſal, or particular? If univerſal, then it ſeemes a wicked man may believe all the untruths which hee would faine have to be true; but that is falſe, many of them ſure being utterly *incredible*; as there is for inſtance many a wicked man would have this true, that *no man were greater then himſelfe, richer then himſelf*, &c. If this Minor be particular, *Syllogizari non eſt ex particulari*; and ſo farwel the good Syllogiſme: No man can eaſily believe it to be a true one, though he deſire it never ſo much. 2. This Syllogiſm looks as if it came out of the Region of the ſecond figure, and therefore ſhould not be ſo liberal of its Affirmatives: we may wonder how it can hold out after this rate, without denying any thing at all in any Propoſition. Let me ſhew you a Syllogiſme of a like bountiful genius, and then ſpend your judgement on it how long it is like 'to ſubſiſt.

This that a little weak Pigmy is ſtronger then a Gyant his Adverſary, is an untruth which the Pigmie would fain have to be true: But a Pigmie may believe an untruth, which he would fain have to be true: *Ergo*, A Pigmie may believe he is ſtronger then a Gyant, and ſo be as bold to ſet upon him as on a Crane.

——*Equitans in arundine longa.*

And thus hitherto we need not be [aſhamed, though this be found in the writings of our Divines, that no wicked man can believe his ſinnes are pardoned.] Yet

6. I deny, That *any wicked man*, let him *deſire it never ſo cordially* and *fervently*, that this Propoſition, *his ſins are pardoned*, were true, can poſſibly *believe it*, becauſe he hath *no Authority of Gods* whereon to build ſuch a *belief*; and ſo albeit he may believe ſome Learned Rabbi, that may tell him ſo in a *dream*, yet cannot he believe it with ſuch a kind of *faith* as a *Saint* doth, which is the *Point* Mr. *Baxter* is to prove.

Advance we next to Mr. *Baxters*

2d *Argument*, [That which is one of the chief pillars in the Kingdome of the Divel, and the maſter, deceiving, damning ſin, is not ſure inconſiſtent with a wicked mans condition; But even ſuch is the ungrounded belief that his ſins are pardoned, commonly called preſumption and falſe faith: Therefore, *&c.* Nay, let us have it in words at length, and not in figures, Therefore the wicked man may have an ungrounded beliefe that his *ſins are pardoned*, commonly called *preſumption* and *falſe faith*.]

True; but is this now of the *ſame kind of belief* with that of a *Saints*, that *his ſins are pardoned*? an *ungrounded belief is no beliefe*; and we do not wrong it (I trow) when we commonly call it *Preſumption*, not *belief*; and *falſe faith* that is not *faith*, as a *falſe Diamond* is no *Diamond*, and a *falſe Syllogiſm* no *Syllogiſm*. All this while Mr. *Baxter* hath ſaid nothing that may make us [bluſh in the behalfe of our Divines, in whoſe Writings this is ſo often found, that a wicked man cannot believe that his ſins are pardoned.] I warrant him, *none* of them *deny* but he may *preſume* ſo much, and have a *true confidence*, though *falſe faith*, as to this particular.

The third Argument doth as little execution as the ſecond. It is this,

[If it be the main work of a skilful, faithful Miniſtry to beat wicked men from ſuch

such an ungrounded belief, and experience tells us, that all means will hardly do it, and yet that God doth it on all, before he bring them by the Ministry to true conversion: then sure it is more then *possible* for a wicked man to have such a *belief*. But the Scripture, and a world of lamentable experience proves the Antecedent: What do such Writings as *Hookers, Boltons, Whateleyes*, &c else drive at? Therefore, *&c.*] Digression against Mr Baxter.

Nay, speak out, *Ergo*, what? Why, a wicked man may have an ungrounded belief, such as before was commonly called *presumption* and *false faith*, that his sins are pardoned; take all, and much good may it do you; but this doth no *harm* at all to the assertion, which [you are ashamed is so often found in the Writings of our Divines.] no worse men, then *H, B, W.* that wicked men cannot believe the pardon of their sins, that is, *truly believe*, and *false belief* is *none*, at least no *such belief* as doth not differ more then *gradually* from the *belief* which is in the *Saints*; for if this *false belief* differ *gradually* from the *belief of the Saints*, that *their sins are pardoned*, then either the *Saints* is *less*, or these *sinners* belief *less*; but if the sinners *belief* be *less*, and the *Saints* be the *better*, only because *greater gradually*, then the *more* sinners have of *this* their *belief*, the *better*, and the *nearer* they are to *Saints*, but *contrarium est verum*, or else Mr. *Hooker*, *Bolton* and *Whateley* are much to blame to drive them *out of this belief*, and they should have endeavoured rather to drive the nail *further*, and to *confirme* them in their *belief*, then *shake* them out of it: If the *wicked* mans *belief* be greater, and the Saints *less*, and both differ but *gradually*, then a belief of a *less degree*, is better then a belief of a *greater degree* of the *same kind* and so the Saints belike are not to pray for too great an *increase of their faith*, the *greatest sin* that wicked men, who believe their other sins are pardoned, can be found guilty of.

Sir, These are clear evidences of a greater *difference* between these *two*, the *Saints faith*, the *wicked mans presumption*, and that they are of *different species*, else sure when a *wicked man* is *converted*, which cannot be done before he bee taken off from this *Presumption*, hee is to *desert his Faith*, and so must bee an *Apostate*, that he may be a *Convert*, and be *converted* from *faith*, as well as to it. Your last and

4th Argument is, [That the pardon of sin is not properly *credendum*, or a material Object of faith, as you have proved elsewhere; *ergo.*] What? belike, wicked men may *believe it*, with a *faith* differing only *gradually* from the *faith of Believers*, for it is not to be *believed*, either by the *one* or the *other*, and the *one* hath as good ground to believe it as The *other*; and *neither properly* doth believe, or can believe it. Well, I shall call your Antecedent to a further account, and to this purpose have recourse to what you say of it elsewhere. I find it in the third part of your Book, *pag.*145.

[As for their Assertion, That we are bound immediately to believe that we are justified and in special favour with God; in the Margent. Their common Error, That Justifying Faith is nothing else but a perswasion (more or less) of the love of God to us, is the root of this, and many more mistakes. To justifie us, and to assure us that we are justified, are quite different things, and procured by different wayes, and at several times usually, *Pessime etiam* Doctiss. Keckerm. System. Theol. lib. 3. cap. 7. Sect. 7. *asserit quod statim eo momento quo absolutio ejusmodi fit cordibus Electorum, Deus immittit Nuncium illum sententiæ latæ, viz. Spiritum Sanctum, qui eos de gratia Dei certos reddat, atq; ita conscientia pacem ipsis conciliet. Ita &* p. 147. seq. *Eodem modo plurimi transmarini Theologi. Vid.* Aquin. *ad* 2. *sent. dist.* 17. *art.* 1. 2. 3. *q.* 1. 2. & Scot. *ad* 3. *sent. dist.* 23. *q. unica.* Bonav. 1. *sent. q.* 17. Biel. *in* 2. *sent. dist.* 27. *q.* 3.]

It is such, as no man of competent knowledge in the Scripture can once imagine; for if every man must believe this, then most must believe a lye, for they never shall be justified, yet all must at first believe a lye; for they are not Justified till they believe; and the believing that they are Justified, is not the faith which justifieth them. If only some men must believe this, how shall it be known who

{Digreſſiõ against Mr Baxter.} they be? The Truth is, that we are Juſtified, is not properly to be believed at all, for nothing is to be believed which is not written; but it is no where written that you or I am Juſtified: only one of theſe premiſes is written, from whence we may draw the Concluſion that we are Juſtified; if ſo be that our hearts do afford us the other of the premiſes. So that our Juſtification is not a matter of meer faith, but a concluſion from faith and conſcience together. If God have no where promiſed to any man Juſtification immediately without condition, then no man can ſo believe it: But God hath no where promiſed it abſolutely; Therefore, *&c.* Nor hath he declared to any man, that is not firſt a Believer, that he loves him, with more then a common love; therefore no more can be believed but a common love to any ſuch; for the eternal love and election is manifeſt to no man before he is a Believer.]

I anſwer to the firſt, That that Aſſertion, That we are bound to believe immediately, that we are Juſtified, is ſuch as I know no man that ownes it; and ſure I can find no ſuch thing in any of theſe Divines which you ſo ſolemnly quote. All that they ſay, is that immediately upon Juſtification, we have the Spirit to make us believe it; and if this be that which no man of competent knowledg in the Scripture can once imagine, I wonder how it came into the head of *Doctiſſ. Keckerman*, and thoſe *plurimi Tranſmarini Theologi*, who ſure had *all* of them a *competent knowledg* in the Scripture; and Mr. *Baxter* will not eaſily perſwade me, that *moſt* of them had not a very *eminent knowledg* in it. But *Doctiſſ. Keckerm. & plurimi Tranſmarini Theologi* do not ſay, *Every man muſt believe he is juſtified*; they will ſay, if *any wicked* man preſume to flatter himſelf with ſuch a *conceit*, he *deceives himſelf*, and *belyes God*; and that it is not *poſſible* any *ſuch man* ſhould *believe* his *ſins are pardoned*, albeit poſſibly he may *dream* ſo, and *talk* of it in his dream as a Truant at *Exceſter* Colledg was wont to cry, *under line, under line*, as if he had been deep at his Study in the *Ball Court*, and no man beſides the learned Mr *Baxter* will undertake to prove this to be *true faith*, differing only *gradually* from that of the *Saints*. Nor 2. Do thoſe *Doctiſſ. Keckerm. & plurimi Tranſmarini Theologi*, ſay that *any one* while he is wicked *muſt believe he is juſtified*, or that this is the firſt thing any man muſt believe, *That he is juſtified*; and they may ſay, the faith whereby a man believes he is juſtified, is the faith that *juſtifies him*; for God juſtifies a man by *giving him faith*, and a man is juſtified by *that faith* acting in him; and how God abſolves a man in *foro conſcientiæ*, but by giving him faith; or how a man is abſolved there but by believing, is more then Mr. *Baxter* hath yet ſhewed, as much learned paines as hee hath been pleaſed to beſtow in this Point. So then, thoſe only who believe that Chriſts death is ſufficient price for their Redemption, and relinquiſhing all hope in their owne or others Righteouſneſſe, caſt themſelves on Chriſt, are the perſons capable of believing this, *That they are juſtified*.

But now for the ſecond, [That we are juſtified, is not properly to be believed at all.] I ſhall conſider your reaſon; [For nothing is to be believed which is not written, but it is no where written that you or I are juſtified.]

I ſay it is written, that *every Believer is juſtified*; and therefore you and I being Believers, it is written that you and I are juſtified. It is true, I cannot cleerly read *your Juſtification* written, nor you *mine*; but *you* may read *yours*, and *I mine owne*; for ſeeing it is written, *Whoſoever believes is juſtified*; *you* who know *you* believe, and I who do the like, may *both* read our ſeveral Juſtification *written*. It is true, *one* of the premiſes is *written*, from whence wee may draw the *concluſion*; but the *Major*, *Whoſoever believes is juſtified*, carries the Concluſion *in it*; nor indeed is this, that *you and I are juſtified*, ſo much concluded *from it*, as concluded *in it*; as in this Propoſition, *Every man is rational*, theſe, *Socrates* is rational; yea, and Mr. *Rhombus* is rational, are included in it, becauſe *both* of them were *men*; and if *any particular* man were *not rational*, that *univerſal*, *every man is rational* were not true. Nay further, however we draw the *particular* out of the *univerſal*, yet the *Truth* of the *univerſal*, *depends* on the truth of

each

each particular Propoſition, and there is (I hope) much more light and evidence in the *particular*, then in the *univerſal*, *quoad nos*. Now then, if this Propoſition, *Who ever believes ſhall be ſaved*, be true, this is as true, that *I and you believing ſhall be ſaved*, and this *latter* is *written* in the *former*. Again, I cannot believe the former, but I muſt needs believe the latter; for if I believe, *That every Believer ſhall be ſaved*, I in this believe *I ſhall be ſaved*; ſo that if *that* be the matter of my faith, *this* muſt needs be ſo of courſe; nor is there required any new aſſent to the *latter*. And thus our actual Juſtification is a matter of *faith* included in our faith of this, that *whoſoever believes ſhall be ſaved*. {Digreſſion againſt Mr *Baxter*.}

When you ſay, [If God have no where promiſed to any man Juſtification immediately, without condition, then no man can ſo believe it: But God hath no where promiſed it abſolutely; Therefore, *&c.*]

I anſwer, We care not how much you diſpute againſt a promiſe of juſtifying men abſolutely, that is, without faith; we ſay, faith is the only condition of *Juſtification*, and where a man believes *ut ſupra*, by a *direct act*, he may by a *reflex act* of courſe *know* that he is *juſtified*.

I now returne to the place from whence I came; and reſerving the conſideration of what you ſay of the *Acts of faith* proper to the *Will*, till I come to examine the particular acts of the *Will*, I ſhall take an account of what you ſay in *general* of the *Acts of the Will*.

[1. Though of our ſelves without Grace, no man ever willeth God in Chriſt; yet on this *willing* hath God laid our Salvation more then on any other Qualification, or Act in our ſelves whatſoever; and yet ſimply to will God, to will Chriſt, to will Heaven, is not a ſaving Act: but when God and the Creature ſtand in competition, to will God above all, and to will Chriſt above all, and Heaven before Earth; this is to will ſavingly; that is, to will God as God, the chief Good, and Cauſe of Good; to will Chriſt as Chriſt, the only Saviour and chief Ruler of us; and to will Heaven as the ſtate of our chief Happineſs, in the glorifying enjoyment of God.]

1. I know not what thought to have of your firſt grave thoughts; ſure our ſalvation depends purely on *Grace*, and without it, no man can either *do* or *will* ought towards ſalvation.

2. I yeild, That it is only ſuch a willing of God in Chriſt (as you phraſe it) that availes to Salvation. But

3. I deny, That any *unregenerate man* hath *ſuch a will*; and ſuch a *will* (ſay I) differs in the very nature of it, from *all the willings* that are found in the *unregenerate*, the contrary whereunto is that which lies upon you to make good.

What you tell us of [a wicked mans hatred of ſin, yea, as ſin, or as diſpleaſing unto God,] doth not prove ſuch a *willing of God in Chriſt*: and yet *ſuch a hatred of ſin*, as you contend for, is not found in *unregenerate men*.

For 1. What if [ſome Drunkards hearts, conſidering how much they ſin againſt God, and wrong themſelves, riſe againſt their own ſin, and they weep, and bee ready to tear their own fleſh?] This proves not a hatred of their ſin as *ſin*; but as tending to *their own hurt*: and I think the *Damned in Hell* are ſaid to *weep* and *gnaſh their teeth* as much as ever any *Drunkards* on earth did; yet never to *hate ſin as ſin*, nor do ſuch Drunkards as you ſpeak of, hate it upon *that account*, or meerly as *diſpleaſing unto God*; but as ſo *diſpleaſing unto God*, as to bee like to prove *deſtructive to themſelves*. This proves not that they do *any way will God in Chriſt*.

2. What if [in our own hearts before our Sanctification, we have felt that our hearts had ſome weak diſlike and hatred to the ſin that captivated them?] This aroſe either from the apprehenſion of the *danger* it threatned us, or the *oppoſition* it had to right *reaſon*; not *out* of any *love to God*. [Upon thoſe conſiderations Drunkards may hate drunkenneſs in their children;] but meerly out of *affection* to their *children*, not out of any *love* to *God in Chriſt*.

3. What if [a mans will may have ſome hatred or averſation from what he

Digressio against Mr Baxter.

known to be evil, and he may know sin to be such.] That still proves not any *love in him to God*. All this may arise from the considerations mentioned before.

As for [Repentance, That the sincerity of it lyes in the *prevailing degree*,] I deny, but that it is in the *nature* of it *prevailing against the contrary*. And that there is in any unregenerate man [a chusing of God,] is not affirmed upon any sufficient ground. Repentance, as far as it consists in a *sorrow for sin*, consists in a sorrow for *sin as sin*, and as contrary to the *goodness of God*, not as *drawing on* the *wrath of God*. The Repentance of the *Drunkards* you mention, had no eye but to this *latter*.

What you say of [those Graces which are expressed by passions, as Sorrow, Fear, Joy, Hope, Love, that they are not so certainly to be tryed by the passion that is in them, as by the will that is either contained in them, or supposed to them, not as the Acts of the sensitive, as of the rational apperite;] is not *pertinent*, though *true*; and indeed it makes against you; for albeit an unregenerate man may have *more* of these *passions*, of *Sorrow, Fear, &c.* then *many Regenerate men*, yet hath he *nothing* of that which is required in the *rational* part, to give them the Title of *Graces*, as not *aiming at God as God*, and *good*, in his *Sorrow, Fear, &c.* Now what if [*Bridgerfidcus* do prove moral vertues, to be in the sensitive appetite, and you infer Spiritual Graces are there too.] Yet are the *moral* vertues there only as the *Sensitive* is *subordinate* to the *Rational*, and much more must *spiritual Graces* be there meerly upon that *account*. But before you prove that *spiritual* graces are in the *sensitive* part of *unregenerate men*, I pray prove that there is any Atome of them in the *Rational*. That they have *any love at all to God*, I am bold to deny notwithstanding you say, [It is undeniable that an unholy person may love God and the Mediator.] I shall examine your Reasons.

[1. That which the Understanding apprehendeth to be good, both in it selfe, and to the person, that the will may in some measure love: But an unregenerate mans Understanding may apprehend God to be good, both in himselfe, and to the person: Therefore, he may in some measure love him.]

I answer, 1. That every apprehension of Gods goodness in himselfe and to the person, is not enough to affect a wicked man with love to God: how many are there, who hate that which they *know to be good*, both in *it self* and *to them* upon *some accounts*, as long as they conceive it to be *evil* to them upon *another*? Now such thoughts have *all unregenerate men of God*; They look upon themselves perhaps as *befriended* by him in *some* particulars, but as at a *loss* by him in *more*, and so all the *apprehension* of his goodness towards them is drowned in that of the *evil* they expect from him. And

2. If you please to consider it, This Argument may be strongly retorted upon you thus. That which men apprehend not as *good*, but *hurtful to them*, be it never so excellent in *it self*, they of course *hate*; but *all wicked men* look upon the Excellency of God as *such*. As for instance, his *Righteousness*, as that which threatens them with *just vengeance* for their sins, his *Omniscience* as that which *discovers all their sins*; his *Omnipotence*, as that which furnisheth him with means to *execute* due judgement on all their sins which he *discovers*; his *Omnipresence* is that which accommodates his *Omniscience* and *Omnipotence* in these respects; his *immutability*, as that which takes them off from all *hope* that he will *change his righteous* purposes of *vengeance* against *Ungodliness*; and so his *Mercy* (which of all his other Attributes, seems most at attractive of their love) stands them in *little stead*, and accordingly drawes as *little of their love*; nay, his *Mercy* to *those* whom they *hate*, irritates their spirits to the greater height of *hatred* against him. And thus can a wicked man apprehend nothing in God of any goodness to *himself* and this makes him wish *God were not*; and it would be the sweetest and welcomest notion in the world to him, could it be made *probable*, that *there is no God*; the wicked man *wisheth it were true*, and would be *glad* if he could work himself to *believe it were true*.

3. Surely

3. Surely, all wicked men muſt needs acknowledge the *Law of God* to be *good* in *it ſelf*, yet how do they *hate it*, as being not ſo *to them*? They muſt acknowledg it *good*, as far as it ties up *others* from injuring *them*, but as far as it ties up *them*, and that ſo ſtrictly, from pleaſing *themſelves*, they *hate* and *abhor* it. *The carnal mind is not ſubject to the Law of God, nor indeed can be*; and in this reſpect is ſaid to be *enmity againſt God*; not only an *enemy*, but more emphatically, *enmity* againſt him. Now they who hate his *Law* and *him* for that, do much more hate him for his *Prerogative*, which enabled him both to annex ſuch penalties to the *breach of his Law*, yea, and to deal with his Creature, if he pleaſe, though it bee not guilty of *breaking his Law*, and they who hate his *Prerogative over all Creatures*, hate his *being* whereunto this Prerogative is neceſſarily appendant.

Digreſſiõ againſt Mr *Baxter*.

You come now to prove your Minor by parts, and

[1. That *wicked men may believe that God is good*, is no more to be doubted of (ſay you) then that they may *believe that there is a God*; for he that *believes there is a God*, muſt needs *believe that he is good*.]

1. What if I ſhould deny that every one that believes *there is a God*, believes he is good? How many *Evils* have the Heathens worſhipped as *Gods*? and how many *Gods*, ſo *notoriouſly evil*, that there are *many better men in Hell*, as *Lactantius*?

2. Yet let that paſs, the *better thoughts wicked men* have of *Gods goodneſs*, the *worſe hatred* do they bear againſt *him*, for that *goodneſs* which extends not to *them* in their *way of wickedneſs*; and when as they are told that his *goodneſſe will not brook their love of evil*, they *hate him* of courſe for his very *goodneſſe*. Why but,

[2. That a wicked man may believe that God is good to him, you ſay it is evident by no leſs then four Conſiderations.] View we them in order.

[1. Men] (you muſt ſay wicked men) [know they have all their Temporal and Corporal mercies from God, which are to them the ſweeteſt of all, and therefore for theſe and the continuance of them, they may apprehend God to be good to them, and ſo love him.]

I anſwer, You have a very *charitable opinion* of *wicked men*, in thinking 1. That [they know they have all their Temporal and Corporal Mercies from God. 2. That by this thought they may apprehend God to be good to them, and ſo love him]. For

1. I am not ſure that *any wicked man* knowes he hath *all Temporal, Corporal* Mercies from God; I am ſure generally they ſeldom think *of God*, ſeldom of his *mercy* in any *Temporal* and *Corporal* good they enjoy; but never did any think *they had all from God as Mercies*, or if they did think ſo, they are *out in that thought*, for certainly God gives them to the wicked in *Wrath*. It is true, they are alwayes Mercies *materially*, but many times far from being ſuch *formally*; and as God *denies* theſe Temporal, Corporal things to *good men* in *Mercy*, ſo he *allowes* them to *wicked men* in *anger*; they have little reaſon to look upon them all as Mercies.

But to the ſecond, I am further to ſeek, how theſe Temporal Corporal mercies, have ſo happy an influence on wicked men, as to make them *love God*; the *more* ſuch mercies they receive from God, the *leſs* they think on him, and the leſs they think on him, the more they provoke him; and when they are put in mind of their provoking him, they *hate* him of courſe; as looking upon him as incenſed againſt them. Did [wicked men love God for Temporal Bleſſings,] ſurely *Temporal Bleſſings* may help to *convert them* more then *Spiritual* ones can do, which unleſs *God give them new hearts*, will never prevaile ſo far upon them. *Chriſts death* will never do it, much leſs their own *health*; *eternal life* held forth to them will not do it, much leſs a *Temporal livelihood*; yea, did they think that God gives them Temporal Bleſſings to that end, that they ſhould *ſpend them in his ſervice*, they would not *value* them. Shortly, Temporal bleſſings *eſtrange* the hearts of *wicked men* the more, ſo little do they *draw them* to *love God*.

2. Say

Digreſſiõ against Mr Baxter.

2. Say you, [Scripture and conſtant experience tells us, that it is uſual with wicked men, not only to apprehend the goodneſs of proſperity, but thence miſtakingly to gather that God doth ſpecially favour and love them as his people, to Salvation.]

It doth ſo, but that they hereupon *love God*, I never found in Scripture, whatever you have done in your rarer *experience*; and in my poor experience I have obſerved, that *the more they flatter themſelves with a conceit of Gods ſpecial favour, the more they take liberty to ſlight God*, belike purely out of love to him; and *the more they dream they are his people, the more they domineer over thoſe who are truly ſuch, and hate them*, it may be out of pure love to God; yea, *the more they fancy of Gods intending ſalvation to them, the more they treaſure up wrath againſt the day of wrath, and fill up the meaſure of their damnation*; ſtill (without all doubt) out of *love to God*. Proſperity, if it ſometimes prevail with *wicked men*, to make them miſtakingly conclude *Gods love to them*, yet it never had ſo happy an effect upon them as to *bring them to love God*, it often hath to *hate him* the more; witneſs, their *multiplying iniquities*, according as God *multiplies their goodneſs*; their *proſperity* uſually begetting the more monſtrous impieties. Why but

[3. Nothing is more common with them (*wicked men*) almoſt, then from the thoughts of Gods Mercifulneſs and Goodneſs, and from miſtaking ſeeming evidences in themſelves, to conclude moſt confidently, *that their ſins are pardoned*; and that God will not condemn them, but will ſave them as certainly as any other. Alſo, that Chriſt having dyed in their ſteed, and made ſatisfaction for all their ſins, they ſhall through him be pardoned, juſtified and ſaved. Many a wicked man doth as confidently believe that God loveth him through Chriſt, and doth as confidently thank God daily in his Prayers for Vocation, Adoption, Juſtification, and Aſſured Hope of Glory, as if they were his owne indeed. Nay, out of the apprehenſion of ſome extraordinary love or mercy of God to him above others, he oft giveth thanks, as the *Phariſee*, *Lord, I thank thee that I am not as this Publican*. And doubtleſs, all theſe apprehenſions of Love, may produce ſome love to God again.]

I anſwer, That wicked men, indeed, from the thoughts of Gods mercifulneſs and goodneſs, have many times the boldneſs to conclude, (as you ſay) that their ſins are pardoned, and that God will not condemn them; but then, looking upon God, as merciful and gracious to them, *living in wickedneſs*, they look upon God, not as he is *in himſelf*, and hath repreſented himſelf in *his Word*, but as they have preſumed to *pourtray him* in their own *fancies*: And if it bee granted you, that [*they love God upon theſe terms*,] yet they love not *God himſelf*, but meerly an *Image of God*, which they have without warrant framed to themſelves; nay, it is rather *Gods not being* that they love; for while they conceive *God* to be *merciful upon theſe termes* they deny him to *be God*. God ſaith, *That he will not be mereiful to thoſe that offend of malicious Wickedneſs, and that continue in their ſins, where he abounds in his mercies*. It is not *Gods mercy* that they love, but meerly a dream of ſuch *mercy*, as cannot conſiſt with either the *Juſtice* or the *Truth* of God. The *mercy of God* is ſuch as would make men *fear him*, were it apprehended by them *Mercy* mixt with *Juſtice*, which *cannot* be *ſatisfied* but with the *blood of Chriſt*; and being *ſatisfied* by the *blood of Chriſt*, requires notwithſtanding the *tears* of Believers. At the moſt, thoſe men love but their *own thoughts* of *mercifulneſs* and *goodneſs* in God, not the *Mercy* and *Goodneſs* of God; which is not *ſuch*, yea, is quite *contrary* to *ſuch* as they think; and as much as they hope for *pardon* and *deliverance* from *condemnation* by it, will no way help them; nor can wicked men expect thoſe Bleſſings from the *Mercy* of God, [*as well as any other.*] Whether you meane theſe words, 1. in the *Accuſative caſe*, as that God ſhould ſave them as well as *any other*, *that* they cannot look for, without a double *lye* on the *God of Truth*; *one*, that he ſhould *not ſave good men more then wicked*; *another*, that he *ſhould ſave wicked men as well as good*, whereas God hath ſaid *both*, that he *will ſave ſuch as are good*, and that he *will deſtroy ſuch as are evil*. Or 2. In the *Nominative caſe*, that

that they conclude as well *as any other*, that their *ſins are pardoned*, and that *God will not condemn*, but *will ſave them* as certainly as *any other*. For certainly *they* cannot conclude *this* with any *probability*, and *others* may with full *certainty*, and irrefragably *demonſtrate* it; God having ſaid *nothing* of his purpoſe to ſave *any wicked* man *while ſuch*; yea, having expreſly ſaid, *he will not ſave ſuch*; and having as clearly profeſſed, that *no Believer and Repenter ſhall periſh*. As little can any man conclude, *That Chriſt dyed in his ſtead, made ſatisfaction for his ſins any of them*, and that, *that he ſhall through Chriſt be pardoned, juſtified and ſaved*. The Scripture ſpeaks much to the contrary, nothing at all to this purpoſe. So that a wicked man cannot poſſibly conclude thus, as well as any *other*, nay, not at *all* conclude thus: then alone doth he *conclude* when he doth it *rationally*, elſe it is not a *concluſion*, but a *conceit*; not a *deduction* from the *premiſes*, but an *impoſing* upon *himſelf*; the concluſion (as you call it) in this caſe being *falſe*, is not the iſſue of any *premiſes* in *Scripture*, and conſequently only a *ſpurious* and *illegitimate by-blow*, unworthily fathered upon them. And therefore as confidently as many a wicked man may *perſwade* himſelf, I cannot allow that any wicked man either doth or can *believe, that God loves him through Chriſt*, as not having *any Word of God* ſounding to this purpoſe; yea, having many that ſpeak the *contrary*, that no *wicked man continuing ſuch, ſhall have any part with God, or with Chriſt*.

{Digreſſio againſt Mr Baxter.}

Yea, but ſay you, [Many a wicked man thanks God daily in his Prayers for Vocation, *&c.*] I deny, that the wicked man either *prayeth* or *thanks* God for either, or *thinks* either of theſe *worth* either his *Prayers* that he may have it, or his *thanks* if he ſhould have it.

Why *Vocation*, if you mean *outward*, it is that which every wicked man ſecretly turnes the *deaf ear* to, even when he pretends to *attend* moſt diligently; and if you mean *inward*, it is that which *no man can have* and *continue wicked*; the *Called* ſo, are *all ſanctified*. Well a wicked man may for *faſhions ſake*, in a *forme of Prayer*, offer a *fools ſacrifice* of *pretended thanks* for *Vocation*; but his *heart* knows it bears not *his lips* company in that *ſervice*, nor doth it value *vocation* at ſuch a rate. It ſets as light by *Adoption*, *Juſtification*, and that which men call *Aſſured Hope of Glory*, which many a wicked man would not value if he knew what it were, and *no* wicked man *can have*, as much as he may ſpeak [*as if it were his own indeed*;] theſe *formalities* in wicked mens *faſhionable Devotions*, are far from proving any *apprehenſion*, and much more any *belief* that they are *real partakers* of *thoſe Bleſſings*, or that they as much as *deſire* to be *partakers* of *ſome* of them. They abhorred to be *called* to holineſs; and if they thought that the *greateſt part* of happineſs in heaven conſiſted in *Holineſs*, they would ſet light enough by it; and prefer an *ordinary eſtate* on earth, before the *Crown of Heaven*.

When they come off with [*Lord, I thank thee I am not as other men*;] it argues only their *Pride*, not their *Piety*; not any *thanks* to God, but an *inſulting* perhaps over his children; and if from their hearts they *thank* God for *Temporal bleſſings*, how comes it to paſs they imploy them to his diſhonour? Doubtleſſe, none of theſe expreſſions imply any *ordinary apprehenſion* of Gods *extraordinary love* to them; nor do they *argue* any *love in them to God*; yea, the more they conceive they have ſuch *intereſt in God*, the more it is clear, they *preſume upon him*; an Argument of *little love*, and *repay his favours* with a bolder *deſpiſing of them*.

[As the grounded faith and hope of the Godly produceth a ſolid and ſaving love, ſo the ungrounded faith and hope of the wicked produceth,] not as you ſay, [a ſlight and common love to God,] but a *common ſlighting* and *neglecting* of him. I cannot yeild, [Chriſt hath a common love to the better ſort of wicked men,] more then to the worſt, unleſs it be *negative*, and ſuch I will yeild in the *better ſort of wicked men to Chriſt*, that is, they *expreſs leſs diſaffection* when they hear him nothing more *love*. [When Chriſt is ſaid to have loved the young man] it is but that as *man*, he ſhewed him *fair reſpect*, and bare *proportionable affecti-*

on

{Digreſſiõ against Mr Baxter.}

ons to him; ſo I yeild, may *wicked men* do ſome *outward ſervices to God*, for which they find they *receive ſome outward rewards*. And I am of your perſwaſion [That there is no man ſo wicked among us, who believeth indeed that Chriſt is the Son of God, and the Saviour, but he hath ſome love to Chriſt more or leſs.] But what wicked man (I wis) doth indeed believe this? I am perſwaded *not one*; *No man can ſay, that is from* his heart, *that Jeſus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghoſt*, the reſt do all call Jeſus accurſed, 1 *Cor.* 12.3. Well, but

4. Say you, [God hath been pleaſed to give thoſe advantages to the Chriſtian Religion among us, which may eaſily procure ſome love to Chriſt from ungodly men. It is the Religion of our Country, it is a credit to be a Chriſtian; it is the Religion of our Anceſtors, of our Parents and deareſt friends; it is that which Princes favour, and all men ſpeak well of: Chriſt is in credit among us, every man acknowledgeth him to be God, and the Redeemer of the world. And therefore on the ſame grounds or better, as a Turk doth love and honour *Mahomet*, and a Jew *Moſes*, may a wicked Chriſtian in ſome kinde love and honour Chriſt; yea, and venture his life againſt that man that will ſpeak againſt him, as Dr *Jackſon*, and Mr. *Pinke* have largely manifeſted.]

I deny, That Chriſtian Religion, as great advantage as it hath above all other Religions among us, hath any ſuch, as to make any ungodly man to love Chriſt.

He who loves Chriſtian Religion, becauſe [it is the Religion of his Countrey] doth not love the *Religion*, but the *Country*; and ſurely there is no man that is a lover of *Chriſtian Religion* upon *this ground* of *Countries ſake*; he may *profeſſe*, he doth not *affect* it. Religion calls us off from the *conſideration of our Country beneath* to that which is *above*; he who loves Religion for any thing beſides it *ſelf*, loves only that *other thing*, doth but *entertain Religion* as a *ſhadow*.

He who entertains Religion becauſe [it is a credit,] loves not *it*, but his *credit*; the ſame may be ſaid of *Anceſtors*, *Parents*, *deareſt Friends*, *Princes*. Chriſtian Religion, it is true, may be, and is *embraced* by *their means*, never is it *loved for their ſakes*. Men may for Parents and Princes ſakes, *acknowledge* Chriſt to be *God*, *and the Redeemer of the world*; I doubt whether any man *firmely believes* it upon *their teſtimony*, even with that which we call *humane faith*; for *this* is that which men are apt to think, tranſcends *other knowledg* as well as their *own*, and they are readier to look upon it as a *cunningly deviſed fable*, which for quietneſs ſake, they will not *contradict*, but will ſeem to *aſſent to*, then a Truth either *commanding* or *inviting* their *belief*, albeit commended to them by the moſt Reverend Authority.

Chriſtian Religion, by your leave, hath nothing ſo much in it (nor is it any diſparagement to it) to *take wicked men*, as the *Mahometan*, which doth ſo ingratiate it ſelf with the *affections*, as to obtaine of them to woo their *minde* in her behalf, and they are ſuch effectual *Solicitors* as ſeldome miſſe of their ſuite; there is in the *Mahometan* Religion very little of *myſtery* to confront the *judgement*, abate ſome *notorious abſurdities*, which it is content be taken for *Parabolical*, and *Mythological*, very much of *indulgence* to the *Luſts of the fleſh*, which are the *better pleaſed*, for having ſome *reſtraint* laid upon them, in order to *matters of Juſtice* and *mutual intereſt*; yea, and ſome ſlight mixture of *ſeemingly ſevere prohibitions*, puts the *better countenance* upon the *dearer allowances* which it gives in point of *pleaſure*. The *ſtrictneſs* (forſooth) in *one point*, which is *ſeaſoned*, ſets off the *looſeneſs* in *many others* the *more plauſibly*. And ſo is that Religion *framed*, as to uſe a word of Mr. *Goodwins* in his Book of the Authority of Scripture, *It gratifies at once both Concupiſcence and Conſcience*; ſo as the light tincture of a *ſuperficial holineſs* gives the *better reliſh* to it in the *minds of carnal men*. But Chriſtian Religion is of a more Auſtere calculation, and hath nothing in it, but what is *offenſive* in the *higheſt*, to *all the faculties* of an *Unregenerate man*; and ſo nothing ſo likely to prevail upon him, ſo as to gain his love as the *Mahometan*.

Nay,

Nay, the *Jewish Religion*, as much as it *burthens men*, yet hath somewhat in it to *ease them*; and they who stuck only in the *ceremonial* part, found no difficult matter to *justifie themselves* by *Moses* his law, as much as it doth indeed *condemne all* the children of men. {Digressio against Bonner.}

Upon these considerations, it needs not be any great wonder that *wicked* men are found to be *deeply in love* with *both these Religions*, and yet are *nothing affected to the Christian religion*: nay, that they [*venture their lives* for those] and hate this to the Death: yet I deny not but wicked men may sometimes [venture their lives] even in defence of Christian Religion, *without any love to it at all*, but only upon such *inducements* as are altogether alien from it. This being the *Religion of the Country* where they were born, and it being infamous to renounce it, or not *professe* it; a wicked man may chuse rather to *lose his life*, then *deny Christ in words*, and yet all the while *deny him in his works*, which shewes it is not *Christ* that he loves at all, but *somewhat else* which he is sure he shall *lose*, if he *deny Christ in words*.

But I goe further, and deny, that *any wicked man loves Mahomet or Moses, and much lesse can he be said to love Christ*. For the clearing this, I shall briefly examine the nature of love.

Love then is an affection of the soul, whereby it is carryed out to an union with its object, and it is divided into that love which the Philosophers call *amicitiæ*, and that which they call *concupiscentiæ*; now there is no place for *any love in any man* to Mahomet, in either respect. For,

1. There is no *union* or *communion* to be had with Mahomet his *person*, however there may be with his *doctrine*; and so nothing of that *amor amicitiæ*; no man can enjoy *any correspondence* with him, no man can love more then an *Idea*, at most, of Mahomet, from his *Doctrine*; but as for his *person*, it falls not otherwise under any mans *apprehension*, and so not under his *affection*.

2. There is no man can love Mahomets *Person* as *good to him*, there being no good derivable to him from the person of Mahomet; the same may be said of *Moses*. Well a man may love Mahomets, or *Moses his writings*, but the *person* of neither is properly the object of any mans *love* this day. For I beseech you, how come *the persons of themselves* to be *knowne* to any man now in being? and if they be *not known*, they cannot be *loved*. I cannot apprehend with what congruity we may be said to *love* any of our ancestours that were dead *before we were born*: well out of love *to our selves* we may love their names and memories, as we reflect upon *our selves*; but sure there can be no place for love to their *persons*, and as little for any mans love to *Mahomet* or *Moses*. Now then, as all the love that any men bear to *Mahomet* or *Moses*, is meerly to their *Doctrine*, not to their *Persons*; so men can have no love to Christs *person*, but *for his Doctrine*; and wicked men not *loving*, but *hating his Doctrine*, can no way be said *to love his person*. That all wicked men *hate the Doctrine of Christ*, is (I should think) beyond question; that *hating the Doctrine they cannot love his person*, is as cleare; even when Christ was on *earth*, he told his Disciples, that *if they loved him, they should keep his Commandments*: he acknowledged *none for lovers of him* then, but *such as kept his Commandments*, much lesse doth he owne any *as lovers of him now*, that doe *not keep his Commandments*: *then* the love of his *person* drew on some to the *love of his Doctrine*; now it is only the *love of his Doctrine*, that drawes *any to the love of his person*. We finde we are *lost without him*, that *by him we shall be saved*, if we rely on his *satisfaction*, and conform our selves to his *example*: in this relyance, and conformity, we are partakers of *singular happinesse here*, and expect *more* hereafter. This drawes on our love *to him*, a desire to be *with him* in heaven, a delight to have *him with us* on earth; and thus we hold communion with him in his *ordinances*. *Wicked men*, who either *despise* these ordinances, or at least *neglect* them, and only *present their bodies* to them, but exercise not their *spirits*, nor *worship him in spirit and in truth*, can no way be said to love Christ, let them *pretend* to it as much as they will. *If ye love not* (saith St. John) *your brother, whom ye have seene, how*

Digression against Mr Baxter.

can ye love God whom ye have not seene? So say I, if they love not those *ordinances*, where Christ is seene, how can they love Christ, who is not seen but in those ordinances? It was said of one, that he loved the King, not *Alexander*; of another, that he loved *Alexander*; but sure none can love Christ, that loves not the *Priest*, the *Prophet*, the *King*: *those offices* of his we are sensible of, we are not of his *person*, but in the execution of *these offices*; and no man that doth not love him upon this account, loves him *at all*; and so no wicked men can be said to *love* him; nay wicked men do not as much as love *the benefits purchased by Christ*; *Salvation* it self falls not under *their love*; for it being a *freedome from sin*, as well as *misery*, and the *glory of heaven* consisting chiefly in *holinesse*, no *wicked man* can be said to love even *heaven* it self.

SECT. 14. Mr. *Baxter proceeds thus.*

[Having thus viewed these several Graces, and found that it is the prevalent degree, wherein their sincerity as they are saving, doth consist; I will next briefly try this point upon some of the ordinary markes of sincerity that are given by Divines.

1. One marke of sincerity commonly delivered is this, *To love the children of God because they are such.* I the rather name this, because many a soule hath been deluded about it: Multitudes of those that since are turned haters and persecuters of the godly, did once without dissembling love them; yea multitudes that are killing them by thousands, when they differ from them in opinion, or stand in the way of their carnall interest, did once love them, and do love others of them still.] This is all *gratis dictum*; yea but saith M. *B.* [I have proved before, that a wicked man may have some love to Christ, and then no doubt but he may have some love to a Christian, and that for Christs sake.] It is enough to say, I have disproved that a wicked man can have any love to Christ, and therefore of course he can have none to a Christian for Christs sake. Mr. *Baxter* askes again, [But may a wicked man love a godly man for his godlinesse?] Answers [yea, no doubt;] and learnedly confirmes it, [for those before mentioned did so.] I desire to know *unde constat*; wel, he proves a general possibility that a wicked man may love a godly man for godlinesse sake, thus; [If a wicked man may have some degree of love to godlinesse, then he may have some degree of love to the godly for it But that he may have some degree of love to godlinesse is evident. 1. By experience of others, and of the godly before conversion, who knew it was their owne case. 2. The understanding of an ungodly man, may know that grace and godlinesse is good, and therefore his *will* may in some degree chuse, or affect it. 3. That which drew morall Heathens so strongly to love men for their vertue and devotion; the same principle may as well draw a man that is bred among Christians, to love a Christian for his vertues and devotion to Christ.] I Answer to each.

To the 1. That we can have no experience of any *other wicked mans love* to godly men for godlinesse sake; we know not their hearts, nor under what consideration their love to godly men proceeded; the *heart of man is deceitful above all things*; and whiles we may conceive that it loves godly men upon that score, it may do it upon many other tickets, which are little related to it. Surely *Solomon*, who (I humbly conceive) had almost as much experience as Mr. *Baxter*, saith, that the *righteous* (that is somewhat lesse then the godly) *is an abomination to the wicked*, and that the wicked man when he carries himself most fairely towards the godly, *hath no lesse then seven abominations in his heart*; none of the actions that Mr. *Baxters* experience can instance in, will prove a cordiall affection in any wicked man to a godly man, *sub istâ reduplicatione, quatenus* a godly man. We are indeed not to be jealous or suspect the worst of men, whom we have no cause to judg other then godly; but we have as little reason not to be jealous of a man whom we know to be wicked. I remember *Granatensis* somewhere saith, he can put no lesse then fifty several misconstructions on any action. Its fifty to one, but we

should

ſhould be able to diſcover ſome one thing or other in any action of wicked mens towards the godly, that Mr. *Baxters* experience hath encountred, to take off from his certainty, that that action proceeded from love to the godly, as godly. And 2. As for the *godlyes experience in themſelves before their converſion*, I know not what Mr. *Baxter* hath experimented in himſelfe; but if he had any love to godly men, becauſe godly; he was godly and converted, ſooner then he was aware. The godly are generally apter to ſuſpect themſelves ever and anon, that they doe not *now* love godly men, purely as *godly*, then to applaud themſelves as having *loved godly men* quatenus *godly before their converſion*. This ſame *experience* which Mr. *Baxter* ſo much talks of, is not fit to confront St. *John*, who ſaith, *We know we are tranſlated from death to life becauſe we love the brethren*. As much Mr. B. endeavours to elude that Text, anon we ſhal ſhew it gives clear evidence againſt all his experience whether of others or himſelf. All that I ſhal ſay at preſent is this, that ſurely *others hearts* are *worſe* then he takes them to be, and *his own* perhaps was better; but neither *he* nor *any man* elſe *unconverted*, wil ever be proved to have unfainedly loved any gracious man, purely becauſe *gracious*. For whereas he ſpeaks in his

Digreſſiõ againſt Mr *Baxter*.

2. Argument of [the *underſtanding* of an ungodly man, that it may know grace and godlineſſe to be good;] and thence concludes [that his wil may in ſome degree chuſe, or affect it] and ſo he muſt add, the man that hath it; ſurely no ungodly mans *underſtanding* is ſo apprehenſive of the goodneſſe of grace, or godlineſſe; and were it, upon his ground, he might as wel *chuſe* or *affect* it in *himſelf*, as *love it* in *another*; and if he might *chuſe* and *affect* it in *himſelf*, what hinders but he might *effect* it in himſelf, and ſo *convert himſelf*? which we had thought had been the work of the *ſpirit of grace*: What I pray, is it but this 1. to *open our eyes to ſee the goodneſſe of Godlineſſe, and then to incline our wils to embrace it*? til the *holy ſpirit* do thus elevate our *ſight*, and *ſubdue* our *wills*, alas, what can we apprehend in *holineſſe* and graciouſneſſe? What can make *darkneſſe* think well of *light*? or *Belial* of *Chriſt*? If *darkneſſe* may have ſo good an opinion of *light*, it muſt *partake of light*. When you ſhall ſhew me that an ungodly man can have ſo honourable thoughts of grace, I ſhal expect you wil ſhew me next, that a *brute* will have ſome reverent apprehenſion of the wiſdome of a *man*. Deare ſir, *Grace* is as much above the reach of meer reaſon, as *reaſon* is above that of *ſenſe*; an ungodly mans *underſtanding*, never yet diſcovered any *beauty in holineſs*. Can you conceive, that *reaſon* left to it ſelf, ſhould judge it *wiſdome* to deny our *reaſon*? This is the *firſt thing* that grace *effects* upon the ſoul? Can you apprehend that the *wiſdome of a carnal man* can judge *well* of *that* which judgeth ſo ill of it, as to count it fooliſhneſſe? this doth grace: or that it can *love* that which proclaimes it an *enemie to God*? thus doth grace. Can you believe that any man can like that which *condemns* him in what he *approves himſelf*, and lookes that *others* ſhould *applaud* him? you muſt give me leave to be of the Son of *Syrach's* mind, who judged the wicked had ſuch thoughts as theſe of the righteous, *He is not for our turne, he is clean contrary to our doings, he upbraideth us, even in ſilence with our offending the law*, and ſo *objecteth* to our infamy the *tranſgreſſions of our education*. *He was made to reprove our thoughts*; he is hereupon grievous *to us, even to behold*; *for his life is not like other mens, his waies are of another faſhion*. We are *eſteemed of him as counterfeits, and he abſtaineth from our waies as filthineſſe*, he looks upon thoſe things which are *purities* in our *eyes*, as *pollutions* in *Gods*. Theſe are the thoughts ungodly men have of ſuch as are gracious, and thereupon ſecretly *hate their graces*, when they are beſt *affected* to their *perſons* upon other inducements, cannot poſſibly *love* their perſons *for their graces*; *the beauty of holineſſe* is in their eyes a *deformitie*, as we ſee the *Moores* count *whiteneſs* of skin a *blemiſh*; every bird, we ſay, thinks it own chick and thoſe of its own *feather faireſt*. In the grave judgment of a *Raven*, a *Turtle* is nothing ſo comely as a *Crow*; and accordingly I doubt not but an *Ape* takes his fellow to be all as diſcreet as a *Fox*, and a *Fox* his *cubbs* to be almoſt as *honeſt* as a *Lambe*. Wel but

Digreſſiõ againſt Mr Baxter.

3. [That (ſaith Mr. *Baxter*) which drew Moral Heathens ſo ſtrongly to love men for their Vertues and Devotion, may as well draw a man that is among Chriſtians to love a Chriſtian for his Vertues and Devotion to Chriſt.]

1. There is not the ſame reaſon of Vertue and Grace. Vertue, it is true, is that which a *wicked man* by the light of *Reaſon* may *approve* in *another*, albeit he *practiſe* it not in *himſelf*. But *Reaſon* cannot reach the *worth* of *Grace*, as which is too far above it. Reaſon looks upon *Vertue* as becoming a *man*, on *grace* as degrading him into a *child*. It looks upon *Vertue* as conducible to the promoting of many *worldly intereſts*; *Grace* croſſeth the *moſt of them*; and ſo is not like to carry ſo much *reputation* with a *natural man*.

2. I do not finde that *vitious men* among the Heathens were ever guilty of ſo ſtrong a love as you ſpeak of, to men for their *Vertues*; I know where they have held *Vertue dangerous* to the *Commonwealth*, and have baniſhed ſome Worthies out of their Territories for no other *Crime*, but too much *honeſty*, which they ſuſpected might prove *turbulent* and *ſeditious*.

3. The *Devotion of the Heathens* was of a quite contrary making to that of *Chriſtians*; it was that which conſiſted in ſome *odd bodily ſervices* which had a *ſhew of humility*; but that of *Chriſtians* being a *ſpiritual deportment*, hath *nothing* in it to affect the *world*, eſpecially becauſe it declines the *eye* of the *world*, and to approve it ſelfe in *ſecret* to Chriſt, is content to *forfeit* its *credit* with *men*. So that the Devotions of Chriſtians and Heathens are almoſt as different as thoſe imaginary Deities, and that Supreme Power whereto they were reſpectively directed.

All then you have ſaid hitherto, proves not to my weak underſtanding, that *a wicked man can love a gracious man, quatenus gracious*: And I am ſtill ſtrongly poſſeſt with more then an opinion, that the Apoſtle *John* his Aſſertion, *That we know we are tranſlated from death to life, becauſe we love the brethren*, is ſo diametrally oppoſite to *yours*, *That a man ſpiritually dead, can love any man becauſe of his ſpiritual life*; that all your endeavours to reconcile them, will fall as *low* as they aime *high* in this unfeiſable buſineſs. Say you, [We may eaſily know he ſpeaks of ſincere love.] True; but ſay I, There is *no true love* but what is *ſincere*; nor have you hitherto, nor will you hereafter prove, that the *ſincerity* lyes in the *degree* and not in the *nature* of this *love*. What if [Chriſt ſay, *Whoſoever believes ſhall be ſaved*, and yet ſhew that many believe who yet fall away?] The *belief* of *thoſe who fall away*, appeares not to be of the *ſame nature* with that which is *ſaving*.

The difference between the *love of a Saint* and a *wicked man*, lyes not in this, That [a wicked man, though he love a Chriſtian for Chriſt, and Grace, and Godlineſs ſake, yet loves his profit, pleaſure or credit in the world more, and that a Chriſtian loves them leſs then he doth his brother,] as you pretend; but that a *wicked man* loves a *Saint*, if he love him at all, meerly for ſome *advantage* he may get by him, by doing ſome *good offices to him* in point of profit, pleaſure and credit; and were he *leſs godly*, and could make the *ſame advantages* by him, he would *love* him *more*; but one *Saint* loves *another* meerly for his *Saintſhip*, without any ſuch *carnal reſpect*. He takes more comfort in a poor, deſpiſed, oppreſſed *Saint*, then in a rich, merry, honourable *Worldling*. *Love* comes from *ſimilitude*; he finds the *ſame ſpirit* in *every Saint*, that is in *himſelfe*; and accordingly he loves him upon *that account*; loves the company of a *weak Saint*, more then of a *wiſe worldling*. The Saints Diſcourſe is more favoury to him, and he reliſheth more the *Heavenly Wiſdom* in the *ſilliest Saints ſimplicity*, then the greateſt *earthly wiſdome* of the *deepeſt Politician*: He takes more felicity in hearing the *Saints* gracious breathings towards Heaven, then any of the choiceſt flouriſhings, or crabbedeſt fetches of the wit of a *Worldling*; accordingly, he takes more comfort in the *ſociety* of a *poor Saint*, whereby he gets ſome advantage to his *Spiritual eſtate*, then in converſing with any *rich neighbor*, who may accommodate him in his *Temporal eſtate*; He takes more content in going to the *Priſon* of a *Saint*, where he hears of the

Liberty

Liberty purchased by Christ from sin, and Satan, and the inestimable priviledges he enjoyes on *earth*, and expects in Heaven, more then in visiting the *Castles* of some carnal Grandee, where he sees nothing but *vanity*, and hears little but *vexation*. Shortly, The sincerity of one Saints love to another, is not to be measured by their [*willingness* to part with their *worldly things* for *each others relief, if need require*,] but by their *esteeming* and *affecting* one another, more for their *Spiritual Graces*, then they do *other* men for *worldly things*; albeit they may *part* with *more* of their *worldly things* for the *relief* of some *worldly* and *carnal* men, then they either *do*, or are *bound to do* for one another. As for instance, A *gracious father* hath an *ungodly son*, and a *godly Neighbour*, he *loves* the *Neighbour*, as *godly*, more then he doth his *son*, as his *son*; *viz. appretiativè*, and accordingly takes more *delight* in seeing and hearing him, yet still he may be allowed to *afford more to the relief* of his *son*, though *ungodly*, then his *Neighbour* though *Godly*, in case both be in like extremity; and if he do not so, he forgets that Canon of the Apostle, which requires *our Charity to begin at our own house*.

Digression against Mr *Baxter*.

So then, I do not find yet, That [any wicked man loves a gracious man, as gracious,] and so there is not the same act of love for the *nature of it*, performed by a *wicked man*, that is by a *Saint*. And this which is assigned for the *first Mark of Saintship*, is not *such an act* as differs only in degree, from what is found in the wicked. I come to your

[2d Mark of Sincerity, which is this, *When a man is the same in secret before God alone, as he is in publike before men; making conscience of secret, as well as open duties*. But (say you) no doubt, as many a godly man may be the more restrained from sin, and incited to good from publike, and perhaps carnal motives, and so may appear better publikely then he is in secret, (for all men have some Hypocrisie in them;) so many an unregenerate man may make conscience of secret duties, as well as open; yea, even of the thoughts of his heart.] But still both secret duties and open, are at the dispose of his carnal interest, for he will follow them no further then is consistent with that. So that this Mark, doth but shew a mans sincerity in opposition to gross Hypocrisie or dissembling, but not the sincerity of grace as it is saving.]

1. If I should grant you all, I see not what advantage it would be to your business in hand; which is to prove, *That there is no difference between any act of a Saint, and such as may be performed by an unregenerate man, but only in degree*. Let *this* of making conscience of secret duties, as well as open, be but a mark of sincerity in opposition to gross Hypocrisie; there may be (I hope) some *other marks* found in the Regenerate, which are such in opposition to *formal* Hypocrisie, as its wont to be called. But

2. Even this is such a Mark as seems not to be found in any formal Hypocrite, as it is in Regenerate men. Such an Hypocrite, I will yeild you, may make conscience of *some duties in secret* out of *fear*; but a Regenerate man doth it out of love: and albeit a Regenerate man may perform some duties in *publike* more fully perhaps, now and then, then in *private*, without any mixture of Hypocrisie; and an unregenerate man doth it more fully perhaps, in private then in publike; yet not out of *love*. As for instance. A Regenerate man may many times *pray better* in *publike* then in *private*, and yet have no mixture of Hypocrisie in his *publike Prayers*, nor be less *sincere* though less *affectionate* in his private Prayer. I remember *Quintilian* saith, " An Orator never displayes so much of his Eloquence, as in a full Assembly; " the *Congregation* may suggest more *matter*, the *matter* occasion more *expressions*, " the *expressions* incite more *affection*, the *affections* of *others* stir up *affections* in *him-* " *selfe*. Thus may it very well be in *Prayer*, wherein we use out *parts* sometimes *more*, sometimes *less*; yet may have as much *sincerity* when we *express* less *affection*, and perform the duty as *conscientiously*, when we do it less *copiously* in private: Besides, the very *fear* of being *suspected of Hypocrisie*, may make us, when *alone*, either *not speak*, or *speak very low*, that we be not over-heard; and either of these take off somewhat from that *affectionateness* which else would be in our

Prayers,

Digreſſiõ againſt Mr Baxter.

Prayers, wherein our very *ſpeaking* affects our *hearts* in a *natural* way, and ſometimes our *ſpeaking freely*, the *more*; yet all this while we may have as much *ſincerity* in our *private Prayers*, and nothing of *Hypocriſie* in our *Publike*; for then alone deſerve we the cenſure of Hypocriſie, when we ſtir up our ſelves to be *heard* and *obſerved of others*, not when we are ſtirred up *by being obſerved* and *accompanied by others*. This is by a *natural influence* which the *preſence of others* hath on us; not out of an *affected endeavour* to approve our ſelves to others. Nay, the *affecting* of a *greater Aſſembly* which may ſtir us up the *more* in the ſervice of God, is (I think) far from being chargeable with Phariſaiſm. We may ſafely *uſe any helps of men* to make us *ſerve God the better*. Shortly, Hypocriſie is in propoſing *our being ſeen of men*, as the *end of our ſerving God*, not the *uſing of our being ſeen of men*, as a *means* of *ſerving God* the more *fully* and *vigorouſly*.

3. I deny, That in theſe very particulars, an *unregenerate* man and a *Spiritual mans* actions are of the *ſame kind*. An *unregenerate* man uſeth the ſervice of God, as a *means to be obſerved of men*, a *ſpiritual* man the being obſerved of men as a *meanes to ſerve God the more effectually*.

4. All *conſcience of performing duties in ſecret* is not alike; an *Unregenerate man* doth it for *fear of his conſcience*; a *Spiritual mans* conſcience is guided, not only by the *fear*, but the *love of God*, ſpringing from a ſenſe of *Gods love and favour to him in Chriſt*, upon a deep apprehenſion of his being *loſt without him*, and his being *found in him*, which (I ſhould think) is not in any *Unregenerate man*.

To your third Mark, [*When a man loves the cloſeſt, and moſt ſearching preaching of the Word, and that which putteth on to the higheſt degree of holineſſe.*]

I deny this to be found in any *unregenerate man*, as who hath alwayes *ſome ſin* which he would not have *touched*: and though he may *hear with gladneſs* a Sermon which ſearcheth to the *bottom of ſome ſins*, yet not of *every one*: Thus doth a *Regenerate* man. Now this is not a difference in reſpect of *intenſion*, but *extenſion*; and ſo it falls in with your

4th *Mark*, [When a man hath no known ſin, with which he is not willing to part, a hatred of his boſome ſin, the plague of his own heart, is certainly an act not found in any unregenerate man; and in this, and this only, doth the life and truth of grace appear: and this you confeſs is not in an unregenerate man;] and ſo *one act*, at leaſt for the very *nature of it*, is found in the *Regenerate*, which is not in the *unregenerate*.

SECT. 15. You endeavor to ſhew, [That ſincerity is not laid in meer love to Chriſt, but in the prevailing degree.]

1. If you mean a *loving of Chriſt* above *all other things*, referring it to the *object*, it is true; but if a *loving of Chriſt above other men*, *viz.* ſuch as are *unregenerate*, referring it to the *Subject*, it is falſe; and that any *true love to Chriſt* is found in *wicked men*, you *do* not, *cannot* ſhew.

2. [*Striving* and *ſeeking*.] by your leave differ more then in degree; yea, as *ſeeking* differs in nature from *ſtriving*, ſo doth *ſome ſeeking*, from *other ſeeking*; there are ſeveral kinds or *ſpecies* of *ſeeking*, though all agree in the *genus* of *ſeeking*.

Again, 3. As all *ſeeking*, ſo all ſtriving will not bring a man to Heaven; there are alſo ſeveral *ſpecies* of *ſtriving*.

Laſtly, 4. *Striving* and *ſeeking* are not the *only acts* of Chriſtians; and theſe are but *Metaphorical expreſſions* of the *proper acts of Chriſtians faith* and *Repentance*. The *prevailing of the Spirit againſt the fleſh*, we yeild, is *neceſſary*; but this doth the Spirit where ever it is: I hope it is in no *unregenerate men*. [The ſeed of the Word,] may be received in men *unregenerate*, the *ſeed of faith* not: [a root] I yeild, in the *Temporary Believer*, but of the *ſame kind* with that in the *Believer*, I deny, and have demonſtrated it againſt Mr *Goodwin*:

All

All [*fighting*] is not of the *same kind*, there are some, *Audabata*, such are all *unregenerate* men; that *fighting* is of another nature from the *Regenerate* mens. The same may be said of [*Violence*.] Digressiō against Mr Baxter

Shortly. The question is not, Whether in some *actions unregenerate* men may not *concur* with *Regenerate*; but whether there be not *others* wherein they bear *no part* with them, as in those of *believing* and *loving* of *God*. We say, for the nature, *believing* and *loving* are acts of the same *genus*; but this *genus* admits several *species*: *Love of Vertue* and *vice* are both *love*; so *love of God* and the *world*; the *Objects* here make a *difference* in *species*; and sometimes where the *material object* is the *same*, the *several formalities* under which the *same Object* is considered makes *different species* also: And as we see *corpus naturale* may fall under several considerations, so as to make *several species* of *Sciences*; as of *Physick*, *quatenus naturale*; *Medicine*, *quatenus Medicabile*, and the *same place* may fall under *several considerations*, so as to make *several species* of *Sciences*; as of *Geometry quatenus linea*; of *Opticks*, *quatenus visibilis*: So may the *same Object* of *belief*, *love*, under *several considerations* make *several species* of *belief* and *love*. Now we affirm that the *Regenerate* and *unregenerate*, though they may *believe* and *love* the *same Object materially considered*, yet they do it under *several formal considerations*; and this sufficeth to make a *specifical difference* between their *several belief* and *love*. And this is as much as we affirm in this case: which though it seem to be of no great consideration, and that this *difference* need not make a *difference* between those *highly valued Divines* which you oppose, and *you*, and *you* and *me*; yet indeed it is of so *grand concernment*, that I cannot agree with you in *this particular*, without betraying the whole Cause I have undertaken to the *Pelagian Adversaries*.

Next, I shall examine the Answers which you make to the Objections brought against you by your self.

And 1. [You object, That all Divines say, that it is not the *measure of Grace* but the *Truth*; not the *quantity* but the *quality*, that we must judge our selves by; and that *Christ saith*, that he *despiseth not the day of small things*; that *he will not quench the smoaking flax*; and if *we had faith as a grain of mustard seed, we may do wonders*, &c.] SECT. 16.

To this you answer, [That this is true of *sincere* grace, but not *unsincere*; and that you have shewed that except it be of a *prevalent degree*, it is not *savingly sincere*.

I reply, 1. That your Objection consisting of *two branches*; the *one* what is *said by all Divines*; the *other* what is said *by Christ*: To the *first* you might have answered more roundly, That *you oppose all Divines whom you highliest value, in this point*; but if [they mean no *other thing then you*,] then you do not oppose them. Surely, *all Divines*, would be understood of [*saving*, *sincere Grace*;] but withal they would say, at least most of them, that all savingly sincere grace is in the *nature* of it, different from those *vertues* which are found in *unregenerate men*.

To the second, Christ speaks of the *lowest degree of Grace* in the *former passages*, and in the *last* perhaps of a *faith* which is *not saving*, as that of *Miracles*: *any love of God* which is *true*, excludes the *love of the world*. *He that loveth the world, the love of the Father is not in him.*

That which you object of [the love of God in the young Lawyer that forsook Christ,] seems to me to be spoken *gratis*, notwithstanding your two Reasons.

[1. Else (say you) Christ would not have loved him.]

I answer, 1. Christ *loves many*, and *more* then hee did *that young Lawyer, before they love him* at all, as *all those* to whom he gives *faith*; *He loved us first*, or *none* of us would *ever* have *loved him*; *he loved us when enemies*.

2. Christs *loving the young Lawyer*, was only *saluting* or *kissing* him, as divers under that passage, and distinguish between φιλεῖν and ἀγαπᾶν.

Εἰκὼ φιλεῖς πόδιστα, μὴ μαθὼν.

[2. Else

Digreſſiõ against Mr Baxter.

[2. Elſe (ſay you) the young man would not have gone away from Chriſt in ſorrow.]

I Anſwer, not indeed, unleſſe he had *loved* him but as a *Doctor*, not a *Saviour*; now theſe *two loves* are of different *ſpecies*, as having different *objects*: and ſurely all love is not of *one kind*: Is the love you beare to your *meats*, (ſome whereof I ſuppoſe you may be ſaid to love,) of the ſame *kind* with that which you bear to your *friend*?

Yea, thus even the *love to a friend* and a *wife* differ *ſpecie*; and *that* love of a wife, which loves, as you ſay, *twenty men more*, is not love at all, ſuch as is *conjugall*; yea, a want of *conjugal love*, ſhews ſhe hath no *love*, but *a ſecret hatred of him*; unleſſe perhaps you can ſhew me a woman which out of love to her husband may in ſome caſes proſtitute her ſelfe to maintaine him; but then I ſhould think, ſhe *loved not her husband*, as much as ſhe may ſeeme to doe ſo hated an *act*, out of an *odd kind of love*.

When you bid us [lay Chriſt in one end of the ballance in our eſtimation, and all our carnal intereſt, and inferior good in the other, and ſee which we love moſt,] and tel us [every graine of love which Chriſt hath from us, more then the world, & inferior things, he wil accept it as ſincere] It is true, but the love of Chriſt which is true, though never ſo weak, makes us *love him above all carnal things*; albeit how to diſcover when we love Chriſt above all things, I humbly conceive, is utterly impoſſible, upon your grounds: for who, I pray, ever did, or wil take all the things of the world into his conſideration ſo exactly, there may be many a thing very inconſiderable, which he thinks not of, that may prevalle with a man more then far greater; as for inſtance, many a *man* may be ſo affected with a *toy*, as he would not with a *treaſure*; many a *woman* may long more paſſionately for that which we would think, had nothing in but what is loathſome, then for all the *delicates* in the world. No man can divine what impreſſion *ſome particulars*, not dreamt of, may make on his *fancy*, and accordingly on his *affections*; and if before a man can know the *truth of his love to Chriſt*, he muſt run over *all the things of the world*, it wil be impoſſible for him ever to diſcover it. But we run *another* courſe, which is this; ſay we, a man knowes there is *nothing* can ſave him from the *wrath of God*, but *the death of Chriſt*, and this he may demonſtrate without being beholding to an exact *Induction*, and finds *that* is *ſufficient* to do it, yea *experienceth the favour of God* to him, *reconciled by the death of Chriſt*. Hence he *truſts* on Chriſt, and conſequently *loves Chriſt more then all things*; albeit he take not an *inventory of all particulars*, and trie his *love to them* one by one, in compariſon with *that to Chriſt*; *but to run over all things* one by one, and try how farre they may have an influence upon *his love*, is impoſſible; for no man knowes how ſtrongly a moſt *inconſiderable thing* may work upon his affections: as for inſtance, many a man hath been tranſported with paſſion for a ſlighting word, whereas he would not have been ſo much moved by great injury.

Sir, There is a famous inſtance in *Venli Faxtar a Calabrian*, who having endured for twelve years together, many a *ſore ſcourging* in the Turkiſh Gallies, rather then he would *renounce Chriſtianity*, at laſt *turned Turk*, meerly to be revenged on one that had given him a *box on the ear*. And I very wel remember, I have heard it of one, that it was a *hard matter to provoke* him to anger, but if a man *chanced to hit him* at unawars ſo as to provoke him, he was apt to be ſo *impetuous upon it*, as that he forgat his uſual temper ſo far, as ſcarce either to *ſpeak*, or *apprehend common ſenſe*. *Ira furor brevis eſt*; & certainly all *anger* flowes from *love* of ſomewhat wherein we are *croſſed*. Saith Mr. *Baxter* [every grain of love which Chriſt hath from more then the world, and inferior things, he wil accept as ſincere; and in *this ſenſe*, you muſt not judge of your ſelves by the meaſure of your grace, but by the Truth; that is, not by any higher degree, if you have once attained that degree which makes it true and ſaving.]

But now I would gladly know, whether this *degree of our love to Chriſt above our love to other things*, be of the *ſame nature* with the lower *degree* of our love; if it

it be of the *same nature*, then is there *no natural difference* between the *highest*, and the *lower degree*, and so no difference in *Nature* between *loving Christ above other things*, and *loving him above them*, which is a Paradox with a witness: if of *another nature*, then is there a *natural difference* between *such a love to Christ* and *all other love*, and so *somewhat* in a *true Christian* of a *different nature* from that which is found in men *unregenerate*. I am of Mr. *Baxters* mind, That [no sober Divine will tell us, that if we love God never so little without dissembling, yet he will accept it, though we love our Lusts before him.] But sure no sober man will say, *we can love God in the least, without dissembling, if we love other things before him*; for our *love to God*, though never so *little*, must be founded in our *knowledg of God*: now we have *no knowledg of God at all*, if *we know not him to be infinitely better then all other things*. It is the same case for [*loving the Godly without dissembling*, and *loving our carnal interest so much better*, as if *they be in want not to afford them relief*.] He who will not *relieve* them, hath no reason to expect we should think he *loves them*.

Digression against Mr. Baxter.

Now to the second Objection.

But [perhaps you'l say, (saith Mr. *Baxter*) If this be so, then there is no specifick difference between *saving Grace* and *common*. And to this he answers, That he told us before, that we must distinguish betwixt a Physical specification and a moral; and in a word, that there is a moral specifick difference, grounded but in a Physical gradual difference, both of Habits and Acts.]

I answer, 1. That he who makes this Objection, meerly *begs the Question*, and therefore none of us will speak so, nor need Mr. *Baxter* say [perhaps we will say so.]

2. Mr. *Baxters answer* is of the same *value* with the *Objection*, and how well he hath acquitted himself in the proof of it, I am content the Reader judge, by what hath been said already *pro* and *con*. I proceed to the third Objection.

[But you may say (saith he) if there be but such a difference in degrees, then how can a man know the truth of grace, or ever get assurance? for who can discern just the parting point? who can say, just such a degree of love or faith is sincere and saving, and the next degree short of it, is not?

This Objection is, in his Judgement of that weight, that hee measures out his answer to it, in five several Propositions; all which shall be considered in order.

[1. Where the prevailing degree is not discernable, there no true Assurance can be had, in an ordinary way. And where it is very hard to discern the degree, there it will be as hard to get Assurance.]

I reply, But this *prevailing degree* is not at *all discernable*, according to *your ground*, therefore it is *impossible* to get Assurance. I prove the Antecedent thus: It is impossible by *going over all particulars*, to know *we love Christ above all*, therefore the *prevailing degree* is not at all discernable. The Antecedent I have proved already, and confirm it further thus. He that shall, according to *your grounds*, go over all particulars, must as well go over all particulars *possible* as *actual*; for if there *may be any thing* which he may chance to love more then Christ, so as not to prefer Christ, and his duty to him before it, his love is not yet arrived to *your prevailing degree*. Now it is impossible that *any finite understanding* should comprehend *all the particulars that may be*; and therefore it can never certainly know that there may not be *something* which it may be so unmeet a thing it should love Christ for it. Add to this, that he who hath attained to such a degree of Love as to love Christ above all things *actual* or *possible*, hath attained to the *highest degree of Love that is possible*; and so this which you make to be the *lowest degree* of *Sincerity*, is the *highest*: and if it be *impossible* to know this, it is impossible ever to know a *higher*, and so no *possibility* at all left for *Assurance*. That this is the highest degree of love to Christ, to love him above all things *actual* or *possible*, I demonstrate thus: If there can be any *higher degree of love*, then it must be either in

Digression against Mr Baxter.

loving Christ *above somewhat more*, or in *more loving Christ above all things actual or possible*; but neither can be said rationally. Not the *first*, for there can bee *nothing more* then all things *actual* or *possible*; not the *last*, for *all more loving Christ*, must be tryed by a *more willingness to leave all for Christ*. Now he that is *willing to leave all* other actual or possible things, cannot be *more willing to leave all*: for if he can, then this *superadded degree of willingnesse*, is either *rational* or *irrational*? I suppose you will not say it is *irrational*, and not according to the Conduct of Reason; if so, it cannot expect acceptance; if it be *rational*, then it proceeds from the apprehension of somewhat *more* then that *degree of love*, which yet is supposed to have *preferred Christ above all things*. If you say, not from an apprehension in Christ, above *more then all things*, but somewhat in Christ, *more* then the *other degree of Love apprehendeth in him*: I ask, Is that *absolute* or *comparative* in order to other things? if *absolute*, so much the *other degree* of love is supposed to have *apprehended* in Christ; if *comparative*, then it is either in order to *something in other things*, or *not*; if *not to something*, then here is no place for an *apprehension*; if in order to *something*, then the *degree before* did not *apprehend Christ above all other things*, seeing it left out *something* in *other things*, in which this hath the honor to *exceed* it.

[Yet Saith Mr. *Baxter*, Therefore those that have the smallest degree of saving Grace, do not use to have any Assurance of Salvation: Assurance is the priviledge of strong Christians, and not of weak ones, or of all that shall be saved. A little is hardly discernable from none in Nature.]

To reply 1. That those that have the *smallest degree of Saving Grace* then, may have *Assurance*, though usually they *have it not*, according to Mr. *Baxter* here: yet I have shewed, that according to his grounds, it is *impossible*, that *he that hath the greatest degree should have Assurance*.

2. That those who *have the smallest degree of Saving Grace* have a *just ground for Assurance*; for *Salvation* is assured to the *smallest degree*, as well as to the *greatest*. And

3. That the *smallest degree of Saving Grace* is as *visible* as the *greatest*, for a *non-relying* upon any other thing then Christ for *Salvation*, is as *visible* as any greater *degree of Grace*; and a man may much sooner apprehend his *non-relying upon any other thing*, or his *relying solely upon Christ for Salvation*, with a disclaiming all *things else in order to salvation*, then his *actual loving of Christ above all other things*, running *over them all particularly*.

4. That Assurance of Salvation is necessarily *included* fundamentally in every *degree of Saving Grace*; and so not only a *priviledg of stronger Christians*. Full *Assurance* it is true is, but *Assurance* may admit of *degrees* as well as *Saving Grace*; for *evidence* may assure a man; but *more*, assure *him more*: this *Assurance* lying in an *apprehension of a certainty of Salvation*, and an *ability* to *answer Objections* to the contrary. Now a man may have the *first* in some cases, where possibly he may not have the *second*. As I may be possest with the *truth of a Proposition*, so as not to be brought to *disclaim it*, when yet I am not always able to *answer every Objection*; those *Objections* though they *puzzle me*, yet do not take me off from my *assenting* to the truth of my Proposition. And as a Martyr said once, *Though I cannot dispute, yet I can die for Christ*. Though I cannot *answer your Sophismes*, yet I will *confess* the Truth which I hold, by *laying down my life in defence of it*. As I remember one said handsomely, Though he had not subtilty enough to unfold the Popish Arguments, yet he had two main grounds upon which he would confound them, and bid defiance to all the Jesuites in the World, *Equivocations* and the *Rowland Plot*.

5. There cannot be *any degree of Saving Grace*, as *saving*, for the *least degree* must be enough to *save me from death*, or it is not *saving*; and the *highest* as *saving* can but *save me from death*: This *Saving* lies in *indivisibili*. Well, some *degrees of Saving Grace* may be *rewarded with life*, and *crowned with more glory*; but all *saving* are equal in point of *Saving*; and Grace as *saving* admits no *Degrees*.

[3. Saith

Digreſſiõ against Mr *Baxter.*

[3. Saith Mr. *Baxter*, It ſeems that the Reaſon of Gods diſpoſal herein, is very evident; for if God ſhould let men cleatly ſee the leaſt meaſure of Love, Faith, Fear or Obedience, that is *Saving*; and the greateſt meaſure of ſin, that will ſtand with Sincerity; and ſay, Juſt ſo far thou maiſt ſin, or deny me thy Love, and yet be ſaved and ſincere; then might it have been a ſtrong temptation to men to ſin as far as ever they may, and to neglect their graces.]

I reply; 1 That here Mr. *Baxter* doth not ſpeak accurately enough; 1 In puting *Love* before *Faith*; 2 in puting *Sincere* after *Saved.*

2 That *God hath told us how far we may ſin, yet be ſincere and ſaved*; *viz.* ſo that we ſin not, *ſo as to allow our ſelves in it*: now this can be no *temptation* to men to ſin, to ſay they may be ſincere and ſaved, notwithſtanding ſin, as long as they *allow not* themſelves in it. Now further we ſay, indeed, That *Aſſurance* breeds not ſecurity, and that though the *great meaſure* of *Corruption*, which liveth with our *ſmall meaſure* of *Grace*, be apt to make *Aſſurance* an occaſion of *Security* and *boldneſs* in ſinning, yet that *ſmall meaſure* of *grace* which is in us *mortifies* that *corruption*; and ſo the *corruptions* remaining in the Saints, do more occaſion their *holy fear* and *jealouſie* over themſelves, then the *Aſſurance of Salvation* doth occaſion *ſecurity* and *boldneſſe* in ſinning; yea *Aſſurance of Salvation* is ſuch, as *cannot* in any *rational way* occaſion *ſecurity* and *boldneſs* in ſinning, ſeeing it is founded in part upon our *hatred* and *deteſtation* of ſinning, and carries along with it that which muſt of courſe *increaſe* that *hatred* and *deteſtation* of *ſinning*; *ſinning* being oppoſite to *Salvation*, which chiefly conſiſteth in a *total freedom from ſin*, and *perfect complement of Holineſs* as well as *Happineſſe*. And therefore *Aſſurance* is that which every Chriſtian may well enough improve to this purpoſe, and ſurely *weaker Chriſtians* can no way *improve* their Holineſs more, then by *improving* their Faith, which is the *increaſing of Aſſurance.*

[4 Saith Mr. *Baxter*, Where Grace is thus ſtrong: *viz.* as to mortifie corruptions] (and ſo I hope it doth, where ever it is, though in the weakeſt degree) [there it is eaſily diſcernable, and therefore to ſuch, Aſſurance is ordinary, except in a fit of temptation, revolting or deſertion.]

I reply: That according to Mr. *Baxters grounds*, this *prevailing degree of grace*, wherein he pretends *Sincerity conſiſteth*, is no way *diſcernable*; for no man can run through *all particulars*, *actual* and *poſſible*, which may draw aſide his Love, upon his *grounds*, that there either *is not*, or *may not* bee ſomewhat which hee may *love more* then God; and ſo no man can have *Aſſurance.*

5. But the chief part of his Anſwer is this, [It is not the degree of love abſolutely conſidered, but comparatively, wherein Sincerity doth conſiſt; as when we compare God and the Creature, and conſider which we deſire, Love, Fear, *&c.* more.] (he ſhould have put Love firſt) [and therefore here it is eaſier to try by the Degree.] (Not a whit, notwithſtanding the inſtance you afford us to clear it up to us.) [You know that *Gold* is not currant except it be *weight*, as well as *pure Mettal*; now if you put your *Gold* in one end of the *Scales* and *nothing* in the other, you cannot judge whether it be *weight* or *no*; but if you put the *weights* againſt it, then you may diſcern it; if it be downright weight you may diſcern it without either difficulty or doubt; if it be but a grain overweight, you may yet diſcern it, though it be poſſible it may be ſo *little* that the Scales will ſcarce turne, and then you will not diſcern ſo eaſily which is the heavier end; but if it want much, then you will as eaſily on the other ſide diſcern the defectiveneſs. So it is here, If God had ſaid abſolutely, ſo much love you muſt have to me, or you cannot be ſaved, then it were hard to know whether we reach the degree: but you muſt put *Chriſt* and *Heaven* in *one* end, and *all things below* in the *other*, and then you may wel find out the ſincerity in the degree. Every grain that Chriſt hath *more* then the Creature, is ſincere and ſaving.]

I reply, 1. That *Gold*, of what ever *weight* it be, is *currant* for ſo much as it *weighs*; and though a piece of *twenty ſhillings* wanting *four grains*, will not paſs

Digreſſio against Mr Baxter.

for *twenty ſhillings*, yet it will paſs for *eighteen ſhillings* and more, and no man will refuſe to take it rather then *eighteen ſhillings*; yea, every *grain* of true *Gold*, is worth as much as its *weight*; and being *true Gold*, no ſober man will caſt it away becauſe it is *no more*. And ſo it is with *grace*, be it never ſo *light* or *little*, God will never *reject* it, no *true grace* how *ſmal ſoever*. So that it is not the *weight*, but the *truth* which doth approve it to him, to be as it were carefully put up by him. No man was ever caſt off that had the *leaſt dram* of *true Faith*, *Love*, &c. all that faith which *Temporaries* had was *falſe*, and failed not only in the *degree*, but the *nature*, was not *gold* but *copper*; and though it might paſs with men, in reſpect of the *colour* and *quantity*, yet God knows it *not to be true*, and that indeed it wants the very *natural* and *conſtitutive* principles of *faith*.

2 I yeild, you cannot judg of the *weight* of a piece of *gold commonly*, unleſs you put *ſomewhat* in the *ſcale* againſt it; but *ſometimes* you may know it to be *light* without being beholding to the *ſcale*, when it is notoriouſly *clipped* or *waſted*; and ſometimes you may know it to be *weight*, meerly by poiſing it in your hand, without making uſe of a *ſcale*.

3. When we do uſe a *ſcale*, we put a *like weight* into the *other ſcale*, and ſo make the tryal: but what I pray, have we to *weigh* with our *love to God*, but our *love to the world*? So that it is not *God* and the *world* which are to bee weighed, but *our love to God*, and *our love to the world*. Indeed if you put *God* in the *one ſcale*, and the *World* in the *other*, then *love to God* and the *World*, is rather as the *Beame*, then that which is *put into either* of the *ſcales*: but if you put *love to God* and *love to the World*, and weigh them, you muſt find out ſomewhat elſe to be the *Beame*.

4. The Apoſtle ſaith, *If you love the World, the love of the Father is not in you*; and God ſaith, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart*, &c. So that there is no place for weighing our *love to the World* in *one ſcale*, and *love to God* in the *other*, for God requires *all our love*, in *oppoſition* to the *world*; and accounts thecif he have *not all*, he hath *none* from us: He is not ſatisfied with leſs then *all*. True it is, he allowes us to love other things in *ſubordination* to him, but nothing in *oppoſition* to him; and he who thus *loves any thing*, *loveth not God at all*; nay, he brooks not the *love of any thing* in *compariſon* of him. So that to ſay thus, [Whatſoever love you have to God more then other things, is ſincere,] is not right; but if you *love God in Truth*, you will love nothing but in *reference* to him, not in *compariſon* with him.

5 It may be remembred, that Mr. *Baxter* ſaid before, [That there was no judging of *Habits* but by their *Acts*.] Now then you muſt weigh the *Acts of Love*, and thoſe are either *outward* or *inward*. The *outward* Acts of Love require a great number of *circumſtances* to be weighed with them; and this will be a long and hard work; and in the *weighing* there is a *Geometrical* proportion to be obſerved, which makes it the *harder*. The *inward* Acts of Love cannot be meaſured immediately in *themſelves*, ſo well as by their *effects*, *Deſire*, *Joy*, or their *contraries*; and to do this exactly, you muſt bring every particular object, *actual* or *poſſible*, with its ſeveral circumſtances alſo, and lay them together in the balance, which will make this work more difficult then is pretended.

6. And the more, for that *Love*, and the *effects* of it, mentioned above, are not to be meaſured *per intenſionem*, ſo much as *per intentionem*, as they uſe to ſpeak; and then ſometimes the *love* and *fear of worldly things* may be *greater intenſivè*, when they are much *leſs appretiated*: to calculate the ſeveral proportions, will require no leſs skill then he hath need to have who undertaketh to weigh all the *States of Europe* in a *balance*; there is perhaps more Art required to the exact weighing of the States of the *leſſer* world, then thoſe of the *greater*; the *ſmaller* and *minuter* the *things* are, the more *skill* is of courſe required to *weigh them accurately* and *exactly*.

And thus, as eaſie a matter as Mr. *Baxter* makes it, to take a juſt account of a mans ſincerity, it will appear to be a ſingular difficulty, if not an abſolute impoſſibility, upon the grounds which he layes.

Mr. *Baxter*

Mr. *Baxter* proceeds to give us ſome hints (as he calls them) of the neceſſity of this his great point, and the danger of miſtaking in this caſe; and tells us [*The ignorance of this his great point, That the truth of ſaving grace is to be tried by the quantity and meaſure, not by the quality, hath occaſioned the deluſion 1. Of multitudes of profane men. 2. Of many ſincere Chriſtians. 3. Of ſome Miniſters, who have hereupon wronged the holy God, and abuſed poor ſouls. 4. That it hath kept many men (to his knowledg) from fruitfulneſs and growth in grace. And 5. That it hath been no ſmall cauſe of keeping the godly in low degrees of Aſſurance and Comfort, by keeping them from the right way of attaining them.*] SECT. 17. Digreſſio againſt Mr Baxter.

I ſhall conſider each of theſe particulars: but 1. in general I think fit to reply, That what he calls the *ignorance of this his great point*, the holding of the contrary; *viz.* That the truth of Saving grace is to be tryed by the quality, not the quantity, and that the leaſt ſpark or ſeed of true grace is ſaving, as well as the greateſt degree, may by *accident* occaſion *all* theſe inſtances, yet be *guilty* of *none* of them as the *cauſe*; and ſurely there is hardly *any Truth* of the Goſpel, which hath not been more or leſs *perverted* in this kind. The *Truth* is nothing the more blameworthy, though *men* by *illegitimate deductions* draw *falſhood* out of it, or rather *caſt it upon it*, and contrary to the natural genius of the Premiſes, derive miſhapen and monſtrous Concluſions from them. We all know it hath been often the lot of the *Scriptures* to be thus pernitiouſly *wreſted*, and that not only by men that are altogether *unlearned* and *ungodly*, to the holſtering up of themſelves; but alſo by *good* and otherwiſe *knowing* men, to the *beating down* of their ſpirits.

To the firſt then. As for *profane men*, we deny that they have the *leaſt ſpark of true grace*, wherewith to flatter themſelves with a hope of Salvation. We deny any ſuch *true deſires in them*, as Mr. *Baxter* acknowledgeth them to have. We ſay their hearts deceive them, and that there is no ſuch *Pearle* to be found in thoſe *dunghills*: all is not Gold that gliſters, nor precious Stone that ſparkles. We ſay, thoſe *deſires* when they are throughly examined, will be found to be *deteſtations of true good*, as *ſuch*; that they have not as much as a *will to good*, as *good*; that had they grace to *will*, they would have grace to *work ſomewhat* in order to the *Will of God*, and be affected with an holy *ſorrow* that they could not *perfect* it; and as their will would be ſeconded with *endeavour*, ſo would they bewail themſelves that their *endeavours* fall ſhort of their *full effect*. We do not allow theſe *profane men* to comfort themſelves with the *leaſt* thought of the *leaſt grace*, the *leaſt love* either of *God* or the *Godly*: Mr. *Baxter* doth, and ſo is guilty of foſtering ſome *good hopes in them*, that they have *good deſires*, though he deny them to be ripe enough to find acceptance with God; but when their *deſires* are come to more maturity, I hope they will be ſo happy as to be accepted: for ſure he will not deny that God *accepts the Will* for the *Deed*, and proceeds according to what we *have*, and not according to what we *have not*; elſe while he provides for the *diſcouragement* of profane men, who have arrived ſo far as *unconterfeit good deſires*; he will over and above *diſcourage* pious men, who many times complain with St. *Paul*, that they have *no more then good deſires*; yea, will not be perſwaded eaſily to own ſo *much*; but as for the prevailing *event* and *act* of the *Will*, they have not learnt the Mathematicks, to be able to calculate the proportions between their *good* deſires and their *bad*. So that now to calculate the *danger* pretended to follow our *Doctrine*, and that which attends Mr. *Baxters*; *Our* Doctrine is ſaid, *To make profane men confident of the ſoundneſs of their eſtates towards God*; *His*, is *ſhewed to make pious men diffident of the ſoundneſs of their eſtates towards God*. *Ours*, is proved to *deny* that whereon wicked men *build* their confidence; *His* to *affirm* that which *deſtroyes* the *hope* of weak Saints, and *diſhonors* God, as if he ſent many with *true grace* of a *leſs meaſure* to eternal torments. To the ſecond.

Doubtleſs (ſaith Mr *Baxter*) *the miſtake of this*, i.e. *an apprehenſion that the leaſt degree of true grace is ſaving, hath cauſed many a ſincere Chriſtian to take up their comforts upon deceitful grounds, which accordingly prove deceitful comforts, and leave them oft in a ſorrowful caſe, though not damnable.*

I reply

Digression against Mr Binner.

I reply, That possibly some *sincere Christians* may indeed *mistake* this Truth, it follows not that the *Truth* is to be charged with their *mistake*. The *least degree of grace* is *saving*, but the *least degree* is still aspiring *higher*; and whoever contents himself with the *least degree*, so as not to *covet and seek earnestly the greater*, hath not as much as the *least degree*. And so we use to tell them, that *Grace* if it be *true*, is *thriving*. and doth not think it enough that it is able to *live in a bare way upon the stock*, but that it endeavors to *improve* and *advance* it selfe to the *utmost*, which by the way, may serve for answer to your fourth ill Consequence, of [*those who upon your knowledg have been hindred, and kept from fruitfulnest and growth in grace upon this ground, that the lowest degree is saving.*] You have had no ground to know, that *these men* had any *true grace*, who *hungred not, thirsted not, prayed not continually* for *more*: and so it satisfies your fifth Objection also, [*That upon this ground men have been kept low in their comfort.*] If any thing keep men low in comfort, it is (I grant) the being *low in Grace*; but those who aim not to *rise higher*, and do not with an holy ambition *affect it*, never attained to as much as the *lowest measure of grace*.

Now lastly, to your third, That *this apprehension of ours hath caused some Ministers to wrong the holy God, and abuse poor souls, and misapply the Promises*. I cannot undertake a Vindication of the inconsiderate carriages of every man that goes for a *Minister of the Gospel*; but if a Minister say but this, that the *least degree of true grace is saving*, he is not guilty of either of these charges. God himself hath said, that *he will accept the will for the deed*, and it is no wrong to God for a Minister to *repeat it after* him; nor can he in this *abuse* any *poor soul* in saying the *poor in spirit are blessed, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven*. When a Minister absolveth any man, he doth it (I should think) but upon *condition*, that the man *believe and repent*; but whether the man *believe and repent*, the Minister doth not certainly know, but leaves that to the *verdict of his own conscience*; onely he gives him *directions* whereby to proceed in bringing in his *verdict*: and if a Minister say, that if the mans heart, can say, *Lord, I believe, help mine unbelief*; *in my mind I serve the Law of God, though in my flesh the Law of sin*; *The evil which I would not do, that I do. O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?* the *man* is accepted of God; the *Minister* is far from either *wronging the holy God*, or *abusing the poor soul*. But whether it be not a *wrong* to the holy God to say, *He will break a bruised reed, and quench smoaking flax, and cast away poor souls that loath themselves for their iniquities, and trample upon his own precious pearles, and cast holy things because little and imperfect, out among the dogs*, let the indifferent Reader judg; as also whether it be not an *abuse* to poor souls, to *deny* them the comfort which God *affords* them, and to *with-hold* the Cordials which God *vouchsafeth* them in this *precious Truth*, that the *lowest degree of grace is highly in his favor*; and that to *him that hath shall be given*, and that *no man that comes to him*, though never so weakly and faintly, *shall be in any wise cast out*.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

In anſwer to Chap. 13. *of Mr.* Goodwin's *Book*, 5. *of his Digreſſion: wherein he pretends to lay Grounds and Reaſons from the Scriptures, evincing a poſſibility of ſuch a defection, even in true Believers, which is accompanied with deſtruction in the end.*

THE firſt Section makes ſuch a Preface as ſome of the Univerſity-men were wont to begin their Sermons with; and may be indifferently applied to any argument. So *Hierom* ſaid of the like, *Nulli rei convenit, quia omni.* Let [Error take her opportunity to build herſelf a throne] where ſhe will, ſhe will be ſure to fall the *lower*, the *higher* ſhe raiſeth herſelf: And your Doctrine of the Apoſtacie of the Saints, pretending [to bleſs them] will, I doubt not, be proved guilty of *curſing* them, and accordingly be entertained, all the nine Arguments which you advance to ſet her forth in her full luſtre notwithſtanding. I begin with the firſt, which runs thus: SECT. 1.

[That Doctrine which renders God free from that unrighteouſneſs, which the Scriptures call a *reſpecting of the perſons of men*, is a Doctrine of perfect conſiſtencie with the Scriptures and the Truth. But the Doctrine which teacheth a poſſibility of the Saints declining, and that unto death, is a Doctrine of this import. *Ergo.*] SECT. 2.

I may be bold to except againſt your *Major*. Every [Doctrine which renders God free from that unrighteouſneſs of *reſpecting perſons*, is not of ſo perfect a conſiſtencie with the Scriptures and the truth] That Doctrine which teacheth *all men ſhall be ſaved*, or that which ſhould teach, *all men ſhall be damned*, may as well pretend to [render God free *from reſpecting of perſons.*] But I think neither of them could lay any claim to a [Conſiſtencie with the Scriptures and the Truth.] If you would have laid your Argument right, you ſhould have ſaid, That doctrine which aſperſeth God with *accepting of perſons*, is *falſe*: But this doth the doctrine of Perſeverance. And this indeed is that which you aim at; how well you hit the mark, ſhall be examined anon. In the mean time it may ſuffice to tell you, that if your doctrine [render God *free* from that unrighteouſneſs of *accepting perſons*] and yet render him *guilty* the while of *breaking his promiſe*, and ſo of *unrighteouſneſs* in that reſpect, it is nothing nearer the truth. There is hardly any doctrine ſo unhandſomly calculated, but that it pretends to vindicate one Attribute or other of God's: but while it entrencheth upon ſome other no leſs dear to him, it betrays it ſelf to be of a ſpirit inconſiſtent with the Scriptures and Truth. The doctrine of Apoſtacie is highly guilty in this kind, as making God either *unable*, or *unwilling* to preſerve his Saints; as making God *uncertain in*

his decrees, as making him *not the ſole Author of their ſalvation*, and robbing him of his glory upon ſeveral other accounts, as much as it would ſeem to be zealous for ſaving him from the ſuſpition of being an *accepter of perſons*. Let the Scriptures therefore be acknowledged to aſſert that principle of *non-reſpecting perſons*, moſt worthy the *Judge of all the earth*, unto God; yea, let your Doctrine be confeſſed to aſſert it too: Yet whiles it aſſerts this *non-reſpecting of perſons* unto God, upon ſuch terms, as to make him *unfaithfull to any perſons*, it is far enough from aſſerting it according to the Scriptures. And yet, by your leave, you ſay no more for Gods *non-reſpecting of perſons*, then we do. [Evident it is (ſay you) that the doctrine of Apoſtacie repreſenteth God as a *non-reſpecter of perſons*,] in as much as it renders him a Judge of the ſame righteous ſeverity againſt the enormous tranſgreſſions of his own children and friends, which he exerciſeth towards his enemies, and thoſe that are ſtrangers to him, upon like provocations.] And ſo doth the doctrine of Perſeverance, which ſaith, that till his children repent, none of them ſhall be ſaved; none of them while *Fornicators*, or *Idolaters*, or *Adulterers*, or *Effeminate*, or *Abuſers of themſelves with mankind*, or *Thieves*, or *Covetous*, or *Drunkards*, or *Revilers*, or *Extortioners*, *ſhall inherit the kingdom of God*: And there are no ſuch perſons, but if they repent, ſhall be ſaved. The doctrine of Perſeverance exempteth not any ſuch, who have been at any time true believers or children of God, from the penalty or doom of this law, if they die without repentance. It ſaith, God indeed will give them repentance ere their death, that they may be exempted from the doom of this law, according to the tenor of the Goſpel; it ſaith not, they retain their right and title to the kingdom of heaven, ſo as to be able to lay any claim to the poſſeſſion of it, *during ſuch an eſtate*. It ſaith only this, that Chriſt retains his claim to Repentance to be given them, and ſo the Kingdom of heaven, upon *their repentance*. It ſaith not, that till their repentance they remain under the greateſt love that God can ſhew or bear to the children of men: It ſaith, that God indeed loves them during that impenitence, ſo as to purpoſe to bring them out of it; but that he ſhews any love to them till he bring them out of it, it denies. The love of Election it acknowledgeth theſe men remain under, in the midſt of theſe deep and deſperate provocations: but this love of Election brings no benefit to them, till it bring them out of theſe deep and deſperate provocations. Children it acknowledgeth them, even in the midſt of theſe deep and deſperate provocations; but all they get by being children, is to be the more *ſorely ſcourged* and *laſht*, till they be brought to repentance for them. That which the doctrine of Perſeverance ſaith, is but this, That God will aſſuredly give his children repentance; which he, as he is not bound, doth not give to others: That in the mean time he *chaſtiſeth his children*, to bring them to repentance; whereas he is content to throw away many temporal bleſſings, and ſpends very few rods upon others, during their impenitence; but leaves them to take their courſe, and thrive, and proſper on earth all along, till they come to the very *gates of Hell*.

And thus our doctrine is far from making [God the greateſt accepter of perſons in the world, rendring him (as you phraſe it) implacably ſevere towards leſs ſinners, and indulgent above meaſure to greater.] Yet if you will quarrel with him for giving grace to one, a greater ſinner, and not to another, a leſs ſinner:

1. I ſhall leave God to make his own apologie, why he gave grace to *Paul*, the *chief of ſinners*, and not to many others who were not ſuch *blaſphemers*, ſuch *perſecuters*, and ſo *injurious*; why he gave grace to this *Wolf*, and yet paſſed by many a leſs harmfull *Goat*; why he gave the *Thief* on the Croſs grace to repent, and gave it not perhaps to ſome of thoſe *honeſter* men whom the Thief had robbed; why he gave grace to *Mary Magdalen*, ſometime a light huſwife, and not to many a grave matron. God, it is true, when he proceeds as *Judge*, knows no difference among perſons; but all impenitent ſinners he will condemn, all repentant he will pardon: but when he gives and withholds grace, he deals not in this capacity of a *Judge*, but as an abſolute *Lord* and *Maſter* of his good things, which he diſpoſeth at his pleaſure, and gives *moſt grace* to thoſe who can pretend *leaſt title* to it, that he may have ſo much the more *glory*.

2. I deny, that God is here an *accepter of perſons*, even in this unequal diſpenſation of his grace; for that he gives it not, as being taken with any thing in the perſon to whom he gives it; witneſs his giving *moſt* to them, who have *leaſt* that can pleaſe him; but that his *favour* is *terminated in* theſe perſons, not *allured* or *invited* by them.

3. It is falſe, [that God is (according to our doctrine) implacably ſevere againſt leſs ſinners, and indulgent above meaſure to the greater.] For, 1. He is [implacably ſevere] againſt none; let them repent, they ſhall find him pacified. 2. He is [indulgent above meaſure] to theſe againſt whom you pretend he is [implacably ſevere;] witneſs his giving them many *temporal bleſſings*, his not giving them their portion *immediately* in *eternal flames*. 3. The children of God, when they commit *greater ſins*, are yet *leſs ſinners*; the Reprobate are *greater* ſinners, when they commit *leſs* ſins. Sins are to be meaſured, not by the *act*, but the *intention*; which God, who ſees the *heart*, knows to be much *more evil* in *wicked* men, when the act is *materially leſs evil*; and *leſs evil* in his *Saints*, when the act is *materially greater*. It is true, that men, who ſee no further then the act, muſt needs judge of the greatneſs of ſins meerly by the act; and accordingly, God in his *temporal judgments*, which alone are viſible unto men, ordinarily proportions *greater corrections* to the ſins of his *children*, then to thoſe of Reprobates; and the *more means of knowing his will* they have had, ſo much the *more* he makes them, and others, know his rigor againſt them in *worldly puniſhments*; but by theſe puniſhments he bringeth them to repentance, whereas others are hardned both by *puniſhments* and *impunity*, and moſt by this.

Shortly, That God gives repentance unto *greater* offenders, *before* their converſion, and not to *leſs*, is clear by the whole current of Scriptures; that *after* converſion men are *greater* offenders in reſpect of the *frame* and *bent of their ſpirit*, is not ſo evident. We ſay, *Grace* works even during thoſe *offences*; and in the midſt of their offences there may be diſcovered ſome *ſecret actings of grace*: And as a Scholar, when he is in a frenſie, though he act *leſs rationally* then a Clown, yet may appear to be a Scholar, his very diſtemper carrying ſomwhat in it above the reach of a Clown; ſo a Saint, even in his exorbitances, may appear to be a Saint, and the *habit of grace* as it were faintly diſcover it ſelf amidſt the wildeſt *actings of corruption*. So that it appears upon this conſideration, that God even in giving repentance to his children, when they offend, which he gives not to others, doth not [ſhew *more* favour to *greater offenders*, and *leſs* favour to *leſs offenders*] and when God comes to act as *Judge*, he ſhews mercy to none but ſuch as had grace to repent. But of this of Gods non-accepting perſons, may the Reader pleaſe to ſee more, in my following Digreſſion againſt Mr. *Playfer*.

Mr. *Playfer*, p. 3. ch. 12.

[AS to the queſtion, When two are equally called, and one converteth, the other not, theſe both being ſuppoſed poſſible, who it is that puts the difference, God or man? I ground my anſwer upon the righteous judgment of God, that *man* puts the difference, and not God: for that God judgeth not his *own acts*, but the *acts of men*; and for that every *righteous* Judge *findeth* a difference, and doth not *make* any between party and party.]

I anſwer, That God indeed [judgeth not his *own acts*, but the acts of men] and accordingly the *acts of men* put the difference between mens conditions, in reſpect of *reward* or *puniſhment*, at the *end* of their lives, in *heaven* or *hell*: But the queſtion is, of mens conditions in reſpect of *grace* and *not grace*, *belief* and *unbelief*, during life on earth: I ſay, *belief* and *unbelief*, conſidered not as *acts*, but *habits*. Conſidered as *acts*, they put a difference between mens eſtate in reſpect of their being *condemned* or

abſolved at the laſt day; and ſo Gods different judgments proceed according to mens different acts: But the queſtion is, who puts the difference between men, ſo as to make that one enjoys the *habit* of faith, the other not; whether *men*, or *God*? We ſay, God. And now what becomes of this argument againſt us? In this caſe God judgeth not his *own acts*, but the *acts of men*: Ergo, God puts not a difference between men in *giving one* the *habit* of faith, in *not giving* it to *another*. God judgeth not mens *habits* of faith, which are purely from his *own acts*; but according to mens *actings*, which are mens *own*, though *from his grace*; *in themſelves*, though *from him*. God condemns not men for want of the *habit* of faith, but for thoſe *acts* which their hearts, not being purified by faith, do continually put them upon, and whereby they as conſtantly provoke him.

1. That it is not altogether true, that [every righteous Judge findeth a difference, and doth not make any between party and party.] For a righteous Judge may out of favour take care that *one* malefactor may be taught to read, and leave *another* untaught; whence it comes to paſs, that though the *Jury* find *both equally guilty*, yet *one* is abſolved, the *other* adjudged to death.

2. That it is altogether impertinent to the queſtion before us, whether [a righteous Judge find ſuch a difference, or no] becauſe the point is not, whether men make not a difference between themſelves in reſpect of the *meaſure* they receive from God, in heaven, or hell, where he gives every one according to his works; but whether God make not all the difference between men in reſpect of grace, giving it *to whom he pleaſeth*, without any conſideration of better qualifications in the men, and *leaving whom he pleaſeth* without it, according to the counſel of his own will.

[Who put the difference between the ſacrifices of *Cain* and *Abel*, but themſelves? both alike inſtituted in religion by their father; God, a true witneſs, teſtified of *Abel's* gift as better then *Cain's*, Heb. 11.4.]

The queſtion is not of the difference between the *ſacrifices*, but the *perſons* of *Cain* and *Abel*: Their faith and infidelity put a difference between their *ſacrifices*; no difference in their *perſons* moved God to beſtow on *one* the gift of faith, to withhold it from the *other*. [Both were alike inſtituted in religion by their father] So were both alike *corrupted* by the rebellion of their *father*, and had as the like good *nurture*, ſo the like bad *nature* from him. Who now made the difference, but God? who, when *both* were alike ſinfull by *nature*, made *one* of them holy by his *grace*. This *infuſion of grace* into *one*, made the difference between *thoſe* who were *both* equal partakers of the *infection of nature*. God indeed *particularly* [teſtified of *Abels* gift, that *it was better then Cains*, Heb. 11.4.] but he teſtified alſo in *generall*, that he beſtowed a *gift* on *Abel*, which he did not on *Cain*; that of *faith*, *by which Abel pleaſed God*; without which it was *impoſſible* for *Cain*, or any other man, *to pleaſe him*. This *faith is the gift of God*, Eph. 2.8. and ſurely as free a gift as any he beſtows on the ſons of men; no reaſon can be aſſigned for it beſides his will.

[Who put the difference between *Pharoah* and *Nebuchadnezzar*? *Quantum ad naturam, ambo homines erant*: As to their *nature* both were *men*, as to their *dignity* both *Kings*; as to the *cauſe*, both held the people of God in captivity; as to the *puniſhment*, both were mildly admoniſhed by chaſtiſements: What then occaſioned their different ends? Nothing elſe, but that *one* of them, ſenſible of Gods hand, groaned under the memory of his own iniquity; the *other* by his own free-will fought againſt the moſt merciful verity of God.]

True, [the *ones* groaning under the memory of his own iniquity, being ſenſible of Gods hand; the *others* fighting againſt the moſt merciful verity of God] put this difference between them in reſpect of their *ends*; but who made the [one ſenſible of his ſin] more then the other, but God? Gods hand lay heavy enough on both to make them feel it; but though it fell alike on their *backs*, it did not *work* alike on their *hearts*. Gods ſpirit made the [one *groan* under his *ſin*] while he left the other to *roar* againſt *goodneſs*. The queſtion is not, who put the difference in reſpect of their ends, the deſtruction of the one, the deliverance of the other? We yield, their *own actings* contributed ſomwhat to both; the acting of *one* did *all* to his *deſtruction*. But who

put

put the difference in reſpect of the *means?* that is, who gave *grace* to the *one* to *repent*, whereas *both* left to themſelves would have lived and dyed in impenitence, and *groaned* at this day under the burthen of their *ſufferings*, more then ever any did under that of their ſins.

[Concerning two equally tempted by the beauty of one fair body, whereof one yields to the temptation, the other perſeveres the ſame he was before; what elſe appears in theſe, except only that one would, the other would not loſe his Chaſtity?]

Right, nothing elſe appears to our obſervation, but the effect; which is, that [one keeps his chaſtity, the other loſeth it] but it may be eaſily concluded, God *kept* the *one* by the grace of his Spirit, *left* the *other* to the luſts of his fleſh. That *one* yields, the *other* withſtands the temptation, is from *this* (I grant) that [one will, the other will not retain his Chaſtity:] but whence is it that one will retain it in this caſe, but from Gods over-ruling him? And yet there is a conſiderable difference between this [*keeping Chaſtity*] and *obtaining Faith*: The one, *Chaſtity*, may be *kept* upon conſiderations of *honour*, *profit*, *common honeſty*; the law of nature dictates, it is to *loſe reaſon*, not to *keep chaſtity*; no need of any *eſpecial illumination or aſſiſtance* in this caſe: But the other, *Faith*, cannot be obtained without *peculiar grace*, and an *eſpecial* breathing of the Spirit; without which, the *more reaſon*, the *more riſing* againſt *Faith*, which ſeems but a *ſilly ſimplicity* to the *carnal mind*.

[The difference between the *Ninevites* repenting at the preaching of *Jonah*, and of the *Jewes* not repenting at the preaching of a greater then *Jonah*; if God did put it, how ſhould they *riſe up in judgment, and condemn theſe?*]

Yes, 1. For that *thoſe who repented*, were ready to confeſs, that notwithſtanding their repentance they *deſerved to be ruined*; that it was the *mercy* of *God*, not the *merit* of their *repentance*, to which they owed their deliverance: *Thoſe who repented not*, thought God did not deſerve of them any ſuch acknowledgments of mercy in ſparing of them; yea, made themſelves *merry* with thoſe ſins, for which it was the others *grief* that they were not ſufficiently *ſorrowfull*. 2. For that *thoſe who repented*, confeſſed they did owe their *repentance*, as well as their *deliverance* to Gods mercy; and humbly bewailed their own *unability to repent*, even when they *actually repented by Gods grace*: Thoſe who *repented not*, pretended a *power*, at leaſt (as Mr. *Pl.* friends do) to do *all their duty*, and thought they needed do no more then they did. 3. The repenting of the *Ninevites*, though [of Gods putting] condemns the impenitencie of the Jewes, who thought they ſhould have known God and themſelves better, and pretended to do ſo, yet did *not repent* of thoſe ſins, which the very *Ninevites* would have *abhorred*.

But [St. *Auſtin* is the man that hath made it ſo ſcandalous, and ſo horrible to pious ears, to ſay, that a man makes himſelf to differ from another; by wringing that place of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. *Quis te diſcernit?*]

It is ſome advantage to us yet, that it is ingenuouſly acknowledged, the Doctrine we oppoſe is more then ordinarily [ſcandalous, and horrible to pious ears] and though to alleviate it, we be told that [*Auſtin* is the man that made it ſo, and that he wrung the Apoſtle] to extort ſo much from him, by a kind of torture, upon this place; yet ſuch is the name of *Auſtin*, as that his authority is like to weigh as much as ſome other mens. Yet if the reaſons produced againſt it ſhall appear to be convincing, we will take the boldneſs to renounce *Auſtin*, and adhere to Mr. *Plaiſer*. Saith he, [*Ex cauſis dicendi, ſenſus dictorum eſtimandus.* It is evident the Apoſtle ſpeaketh *de donis gratis datis*, not *de donis gratum facientibus*: Of Eloquence, Knowledge, Tongues, and the like; not of Faith, Charity, Repentance, Converſion, and the like.]

Be it yielded; and take in the great Names of the Remonſtrant Doctors in the Conference at the *Hague*, to give it the better countenance; and [Dr. *Ames* his Conceſſion to boot, *De tali Doctorum diſcretione agit hic Apoſtolus, non nego:*] but then his addition will overthrow all, *Sed tali agit argumento, ut ad fidelium etiam diſcretionem optimè poſſit applicari.* And this Reply, that [then the Text is not direct, but but by application may be well uſed to this purpoſe] doth not ſeem to me to ſalve the wound:

wound: Though the Text ſpeak not *directly* of the graces of *Faith*, *Charity*, *Repentance*, yet the *Concluſion is directly drawn* from the *Text*; and ſo clear is the deduction, that a little Logick will ſuffice either to draw it, or defend it. Dr. *Ames* Reaſons here alleadged ſeem to be ſuch, as the Anſwers are no matches for them.

1. *Quia generalis eſt aſſertio, In nulla re te diſcernis.* That is, becauſe the aſſertion is generall, *In nothing doſt thou make thy ſelf to differ.* This it is ſaid, [1. The text ſaith not. 2. Or at leaſt this is the queſtion, Whether under the aids and means of faith, common to thee, and to another, thou do not make the difference, when thou believeſt, and the other doth not?] I anſwer, 1. The text indeed hath not theſe very words, *In nulla re te diſcernis:* Let theſe be Dr. *Ames* his words; it matters not, as long as S. *Pauls* words be equivalent. *Quis te diſcrevit?* ſaith *Paul.* In what, I pray? He names nothing; what hinders therefore, but that he means all things? *Quis te diſcrevit*, is a more emphatical expreſſion of *Nemo te diſcrevit.* This *diſcrevit* not having a reſtraint upon it, is equivalent to an univerſal: *Quis te in ulla re diſcrevit? Nemo te in ulla: Ergo Deus in omni.* And if it be well obſerved, though the Apoſtle be ſpeaking of the *gifts* of *Doctors* in the verſe *precedent*, yet *here* he ſpeaks to *every Brother*, Who made *thee* to differ? not, who made *them?* And, what haſt *thou* which thou haſt not received? not, what have *they?* As if he had ſaid, Even *thou* haſt nothing at all, the *leaſt* grace that is *moſt common*, but thou haſt *received* it: nor didſt *thou* make *thy ſelf* to differ by *any grace* from *another* that wants *it*; therefore much leſs did *theſe Doctors* make *themſelves* to differ: *Thy ſmall faith* is Gods *great gift*; therefore much more *that faith* of the Apoſtles, whereby they are enabled to do ſuch miracles, and *that grace* whereby they were enabled to beget thee and confirm *thee* in the faith.

2. When it is ſaid, [The queſtion is, whether under the aids and means of faith, common to thee and to another, thou do not make the difference, when thou believeſt, and the other doth not?] this is a meer miſrepreſentation of the queſtion: For if it be underſtood of *outward aids and means of faith*, we anſwer preſently, that where the *outward* are *equal*, the *inward* are *different:* And that *I believe*, when *another doth not*, under the ſame *outward aids and means*, my *belief* is to be attributed to an *inward work* upon *my* ſpirit, which was not wrought on *his*; though he had the *ſame outward means*, I had *more inward movings.* But if it be underſtood of [equal aids and means of faith] as well *inward* as *outward*, then the ſuppoſition is falſ, that there is ever ſuch an *inequality* of the *effect* under ſuch an *equality of the means*; and it will be neceſſary to ſhew, that there is ſuch *inequality of the effect* under ſuch an *equality of the means*; elſe we ſuperfluouſly enquire into the *cauſe* of this *inequality* of the *effect* under ſuch an *equality* of the *means*.

Reaſ. 2. *Quia multo minus fides homini tribui debet, ſi non chariſmata ſibi comparare vel augere poteſt.* This [*multo minus* (ſaith Mr. *Plaiſer*) hath in it *nihil minus*] and he pretends to demonſtrate it by a [reaſon which the Remonſtrants did not] why this Text cannot be applied to gifts neceſſary to ſalvation. [1. Becauſe in them God wills not that difference which is between believers and unbelievers, under the word of faith, but would have *all believe* and *obey the Goſpel.* 2. This difference offendeth and diſpleaſeth God. And, 3. it proceedeth as much from the *diſobedience* of him that believeth not, as it doth from the *obedience* of him that believeth: but of *that part* of the difference which is by *diſobeying*, God (I trow) is not the Author. 4. It is ſin and ſhame to him that wanteth *faith*, after the means of faith afforded him; but no blame to him that ſpeaks not with *tongues*, or *propheſieth* not. 5. Theſe were given ſuddenly and immediately, without labour or means; but faith, and the reſt needfull to ſalvation, had *means* by which God gave them, about which *means* men might uſe a *different diligence.*]

I anſwer, that this *multo minus* hath ſo much in it, that it is like to be *nihil minus* for all that is here ſaid againſt it. And

1. I make it good κατασκευαστικῶς, thus: The grace of *Faith* is ſuch, as of all *others* men can *leaſt pretend* to be the *cauſe* of it; much leſs then of *Learning*, *Eloquence*, &c. They have ſome a prompter *wit*, which makes them more capable then others;

others; ſome, a plainer *Teacher*; ſome, fairer *opportunities* of ſtudy; ſome, frequenter *helps* of *converſing*. Many a thing may be eaſily thought of, which may ſuffice to make a conſiderable difference between men in reſpect of *Learning* and *Eloquence*: but as for *Faith*, all are by nature *alike indiſpoſed to it*; and the *more knowledge* men have, the *more* they are apt to oppoſe it; the *more moral vertues*, the *more* apt they are to think they have *no need of it*; that ſtanding upon their *own* righteouſneſs, they need not *ſubmit* to the *righteouſneſs of Chriſt*. Here is in *all* men a *like* oppoſition againſt this *myſterie of godlineſs*; and though their *genius's* have different places, as it were, in the *circumference*, they all meet exactly in this *center*. So that men have much more colour for ſacrificing to themſelves for their *Learning*, whereof, as Dr. *Prideaux* was wont to ſay, they brought three parts into the world, than for their *Faith*, which is a gift infuſed from heaven in the great work of Regeneration. And yet have they none at all to ſacrifice to themſelves even for *this*: For who made them to differ from other weak-parted men? In reſpect of the temper of their organs, they did not mould their heads, nor tune their nerves *themſelves*: Their *Parents*, though they contributed ſomwhat to the work, yet many times *weaker* parents have *ſtronger* children, and *wiſer* parents *weaker* children; yea, the *ſame parents* do not always furniſh the world with children of the *ſame ſize* for *intellectuals*. So that they may challenge but little of being the cauſes of *this difference* in regard of mens *birth*, or much more of being the cauſes of *this difference* in regard of their *education*: They whom they have commended to the beſt *Tutors*, have often proved the worſt *Truants* and *Sots*. Nor may the children arrogate more to their *own induſtry*: How have many ſtudied themſelves out of their *health*, yet into nothing the more *learning*; but after much coſt and pains, returned from the School with as little a packet of learning as they carried thither, and not added any one new notion to their old ſtock, which was as much as could be well beſtowed in their *cerebellum*? Now then if there be *more* to be ſaid for *this*, that men may make themſelves to differ in *learning* from others, then in *faith*; and yet *nothing* at all for *this*, but that the *whole difference* muſt be aſcribed to God as the only Author; what, I pray, is to be ſaid in the behalf of *this*, that men may make themſelves to differ from others in reſpect of *faith*?

2. Ἀναγκαιότατα, and to your

1. Argument, that [God wills not that difference which is between believers and unbelievers under the word of faith, but would have *all* believe and obey the Goſpel] it is ſooner ſaid then proved. Did not God will a difference between believers and unbelievers, *Act.* 13. where it is ſaid, *As many as were ordained to eternal life believed*? Did he not, when to ſome he makes the Word a *ſavour of life unto life*, and leaves it to be to others the *ſavour of death unto death*: When *ſome* eyes he *opens*, and *leaves others*, that *ſeeing they may ſee and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not underſtand*? I yield, he would have [*all to whom the Goſpel is preached*, believe and obey it] but it is by his will *ſigni*, not *beneplaciti*. I have read of *ſome*, to *whom it was given to know the myſteries of the Kingdom*; when to *others*, it was all ſpoken in parables: the ſame words were intended for a dark-parable to *ſome*, for a clear precept to *others*. God, in ſending the Goſpel, *wills* the faith of *none* but *ſuch* as he *wills to give it to*: but this he doth not *to all*; he beſtows not this *jewel*, but on ſuch as he intends to *eſpouſe to himſelf*. So then I may ſafely conclude, it is not at all proved, as much as it is affirmed, that [God wills not that difference which is between believers and unbelievers under the word of faith.]

To the 2. I yield, [this difference offendeth and diſpleaſeth God] it follows not, that God *wills not this difference*: He *wills many a thing* to be, with which he is notwithſtanding offended and diſpleaſed: Sure he wills, *i.e.* permits ſin to be, yet is he (I take it) offended with it; and as he wills, *i.e.* permits *ſin to be*, ſo doth he the *difference* we are now ſpeaking of; for *that part* which concerns *unbelief*, he permits it to be, when he could hinder.

To the 3. When it is ſaid, [The difference proceedeth *as much* from the *diſobedience* of him that believeth not, as from the *obedience* of him that believeth] I muſt crave leave to deny it; there being a greater *agreement* between men in reſpect of *diſobedi-*

ence

ence, then there is *difference* in reſpect of *obedience* and *diſobedience*; and the *agreement* being *natural*, the *difference ſupernatural*, the *difference* cannot be ſaid to proceed *ſo much* from *diſobedience* of the *unbeliever*, as *obedience* of the *believer*. And

To the 4. What if [of *that part of the difference which is by diſobeying God*, God be not the author?] it is enough that he alone makes that part of *difference* which is by *obeying* God, which rather is the *only thing* that puts the *difference*. Till this work of God upon his choſen people, they are *all* as *bad* as the *reſt*, *all alike*: The *difference*, it is clear, is wholly of Gods making; ſeeing that *particular*, the having whereof makes ſome *few* men *differ* from *all others*, is *wholly from God*.

To the 5. But [it is ſin and ſhame to him that wanteth faith, after the means of faith afforded him; but no blame to him that ſpeaks not with tongues, or propheſieth not.] If it be added, *having the means afforded him*, and a *command laid upon him to uſe them*, it is both *ſin* and *ſhame*; *ſin* to *neglect* the *means*, *ſhame* not to *attain* to the skill in *tongues*. For *Prophecie*, it is not a *ſtanding* habit, but an *occaſional inſpiration*, and ſo not within the verge of the preſent cauſe.

To the 6. Nay, but [*theſe*, viz. *tongues* and *prophecie*, were given ſuddenly and immediately, without labour or means: but *faith*, and the reſt needfull to ſalvation, had *means* by which God gave them, about which means men might uſe a different diligence.] I humbly conceive, that faith is given as [ſuddenly and immediately] as tongues and prophecie. And 1. though there be means wherein men may uſe a different diligence for the *exerciſing* of faith, and ſo *ſubduing corruptions* in their hearts, yet the *habit* is infuſed by God himſelf, and that for every *degree*. And 2. what if the gift of tongues and prophecie were not [without means] as to the *exerciſing* of them? *Prayer*, yea *Muſick* it ſeems by *Eliſha's* minſtrel, might have ſome influence in this kind.

In ſhort, I yield the gift of *prophecie* and *tongues* were ſuch, as wherein God appears to *others* to work *more* upon the ſpirits of thoſe men on whom he beſtows them: but he appeared, I dare ſay, to *thoſe good men themſelves*, to work more upon them in making them *believe*, then either to *ſpeak* with *tongues*, or *propheſie*. When he made them ſpeak with *tongues* and *propheſie*, he, it is true, did *all* the work, but they did *nothing to oppoſe it*, as well as *nothing to promote it*: but when he made them *believe* and *repent*, he did *all the work*, and they would have confeſſed they had that within them which did *all it could* againſt it; that their luſts ſtormed, their reaſon ſwaggered, their imaginations drawled, that all their faculties conſpired in a common inſurrection and rebellion againſt him. And thus the Apoſtles would have confeſſed, that God made them differ *more from themſelves* when he made them *believers*, then from *others* when he made them *ſpeakers of various languages*, and *Prophets*.

When [the Scriptures ſpeak of Gods *meaſuring to every man as he will*, as *Rom.* 12. 3. *Eph.* 4. 8. 1 *Cor.* 12. 11. Theſe places reſpect thoſe gifts of the Holy Ghoſt that were given for *the publique ſervice* of the Church; as if the meaſure, that is, of ſaving graces to be ſo ſmall as it is, proceeded from mens *negligence* rather then Gods *diſpenſation*. But admit, that God putteth and approveth a *different meaſure* even of ſaving graces; yet that *difference* of an *emptineſs* and *abſence of faith in them that hear the word*, he putteth not, he approveth not.]

I willingly yield, that theſe places reſpect ſuch gifts as were given for the [publique ſervice of the Church] and that it is true (though theſe Texts intimate nothing to that purpoſe) that [the meaſure of ſaving graces to be ſo ſmall, proceedeth from mens negligence rather then Gods diſpenſation] but withall, that the meaſure of ſaving graces is *any at all*, proceedeth more from Gods *diſpenſation* then from mans *diligence*. Surely it is to be admitted beyond contradiction, that God putteth a different meaſure even of ſaving graces; for to *ſome* he gives a *ſtrong faith*, and the *weaker faith* of *others* is *no leſs his gift*, yea *no leſs a gift*; for that he gives *heaven* to thoſe to whom he gives a *weaker faith*, as well as to *thoſe* to whom he gives a *ſtronger*; and *thoſe* to whom he gives a *weaker faith*, he keeps on earth from *greater temptations*. Thoſe to whom he gives *leſs faith*, he indeed affords *leſs comfort on earth*, but gives them for ought we know

know as *great happineſs in heaven*: And though he [*approves not weakneſs in any*] yet he *approves ſtrength of faith*, and ſo the *difference* of *ſtronger* faith in *ſome*, and *weaker* in *others*.

As for that of [emptineſs and abſence of faith] conſidering that, *that* implies a *preſence* and *happy meaſure* of faith in *others*. God may be well enough ſaid to put *this faith*, and ſo ſure he *approves* it, and conſequently even *this difference* alſo; for the preſence of faith is that alone which makes the difference.

Laſtly [the difference in the meaſure of the gifts of all ſorts, may come from God that giveth, but the different uſing of theſe gifts doth come from man that is to reckon with God about the uſing of them. That *one* Servant *received five*, another *two*, another *one* Talent, this *difference* was from the *Lord*; but that one ſervant *gained five*, another *two*, another *none*, was not from the *Lord*, but from the Servants: whence *one* heareth, *Euge bone ſerve!* and another, *Serve nequam & piger!*]

I anſwer, That the *uſing* of all gifts is from God, as well as the *gifts*: And though that *ſome make no uſe of them*, be only from themſelves; yet there is no *gift of faith* that was left to lie *without uſing*. The Talents here ſignifie *natural*, not ſpiritual *gifts*; and ſo [the account which men ſhall be called to for not uſing them] falls not into the preſent reckoning.

[Being ſecure of this place of S. *Paul* (ſaith Mr. *Plaiſer*) I come with greater confidence, to avoid thoſe abſurdities, in preſſing of which ſome ſo much triumph. They ſay, that if man make the difference between himſelf and another, then it followes,

1. That God doth no more for his Elect, then for the Reprobate.
2. That the Saints have no more to give thanks to God for, then the wicked.
3. That one man may glory againſt another, for that he hath done ſomething more then another did.]

To theſe he anſwers, 1. in particular, 2. in generall.

[1. To the firſt (ſaith he) admitting for a while, that God in the grace of *Vocation* doth no more for the *Elect* then for the *Reprobate*, yet in the grace of *Predeſtination* he doth incomparably more.]

I anſwer, That God doth *nothing* in Predeſtination at all for the Reprobate, no nor Elect neither: that being a *deſignation*, rather then a *doing*; an *ordering* how to do or act, not a *doing or acting* for any mans *good*; and being an *immanent* act, can *immediately produce nothing*.

2. That God in his Predeſtination doth *order* nothing to the Elect to be conferred upon them, but either in *order* to their *Vocation*, or in *dependance* upon their *Vocation*. In *order* to it, as the *place* where they ſhall *inhabit*, the *perſons* with whom they ſhall *converſe*: Or in *dependance* on it, as *juſtification* and *glorification*, as the Apoſtle gives the links of this chain of Predeſtination, *Rom.* 8. Now then it is impoſſible that he ſhould predeſtinate the Elect to more good then what he decrees to work, either in *order* to their *Calling*, or in *dependance* upon it. But thus if he *works* no more, we muſt acknowledge he *decreed* no more good to the Elect then Reprobate, and conſequently did not [incomparably more for them in the grace of Predeſtination] if [he did no more for them then the Reprobate in their Vocation.] But let us examine Mr. *Plaiſers* Reaſons, [In that foreknowing the different *ſucceſſes* of his *Calling*, and the *ends* of the *Called* ſo different, he was pleaſed to decree and confirm *that Calling* to *ſome*, which he foreknew would be *ſaving* to them; and to decree *no other to the reſt*, then that which he foreſaw would *not be ſaving* to them, through *their own diſobedience*, when it was in *his power* to have *altered their Calling* to ſuch as obedience in his knowledge would have followed. So that in the *preparation* and *execution* of his gracious *Calling*, which God knew would prove happily to *theſe*, his election of them, and his love to them appeareth *ſingular*, and they have infinite reaſon of gratitude *above* the Reprobate. The Reprobate have cauſe to thank God, for preparing *that Calling*, wherby they *might have been ſaved*, as wel as others *are*; and are to blame *only their own contempt* and folly: but they have not this to thank God for, that he did *alter their Calling* to a *better*, when he found the *event* of *this*, would be *evil* unto them; neither

can they blame him, seeing he was no way *bound* so to do; for if he were, he should not have suffered *any* to perish at all. And, the Elect who obey their Calling, which of them can tell in the preparation of their Calling, how often God changed it, and amended it, (to speak after our manner of understanding, who use to bring things thus to perfection and to our liking) untill he had brought it to that order, as whereof he saw the *effect* would be the free conversion of the Called?]

I answer, 1. It is clear, that here he confesseth that God did *give*, as well as decree a Calling to *some* which [he knew would be effectual] and to *others* not; and so there is a difference in their *actual calling* answerable to that of his *decree*.

2. I deny that God did [*alter his decree of calling* to any] 1. That is affirmed without proof. 2. There is manifest reason against it; for it puts a *variableness* in Gods *decrees*, and injuriously aspersеth him with decreeing first *one kind of Calling*, secondly *another*.

3. If the same Calling prove effectual to *one*, and not to *another*, it is evident *one man* is *better* then *another*, as being wrought to good by *that* which *another is not*. This making of God to [alter his decrees] or to give the same calling to one and to another, is attended with too many consequences derogatory from *God*, and apt to swell and puff up *man*.

What he addeth of the [oftenness of calling one more then another] makes as much against him: For if one be [called oftner] then he is *more* called then *another*; and if he be [oftner called] yet only with the *same* calling, the same calling will work *no more one time* then *another*, unless he be *better* prepared at *one* time then *another*: And then I demand, whence ariseth this *difference of preparation*? If the *better* preparation be from God, that is a *better calling*; if from the man himself, let him shew how any preparation of a *mans own* can so happily qualifie him to answer *Gods calling*. [That which the Church saith in the Homily of the *Knowledge of the Scripture*, par. 3. p. 5. *That God receiveth the learned and unlearned, and casteth away none, but is indifferent to all*] doth relate but to *all kinds*, not to *all particulars* among men; and this *indifferencie* to *all kinds* of men may very well consist with an *inequality* of dispensation towards *individuals*.

To the second Mr. *P.* answers, for matter of thankfulness, [That as grace is not therefore grace, because it is *given* to *one*, and *denied* to *another*, but because it is given to the *unworthy*, (for grace were not the *less* grace, but *greater*, if it were given to *all*) so his thanks are not therefore given to God, because God hath been mercifull to *him* more then *another*, but because he hath been mercifull to him *unworthy*: and his thanks are not diminished, because many *more* are partakers with him in the same benefit, but the *greater*; and should have been yet *greater*, had more still been partakers then are.]

I answer, Grace is *grace*, even because it is given to *one* more then *another*, and challengeth thanks upon that account. So Christ saith, *To you it is given, to others it is not given*; and upon *this account* requires thanks. Our *unworthiness*, it is true, is that which makes *grace* the *more eminent*, and consequently should excite us to the *more thanks*: but our unworthiness appears in nothing more, then when we see those who seemed not altogether so unworthy, to be favoured with *less grace*; God *hiding his mysteries from the wise and prudent, and revealing them to babes*; *Calling not many mighty, not many wise, but weak and foolish things of the world, and things which are not*. And surely the *fewer* are partakers of *grace*, the *more thanks* do we owe to God for vouchsafing it to *us*; nor could our thanks have been *greater*, but *less*, had *all* been partakers of it: We cannot be so thankfull for that *blessing* wherein *all* share, as for that which is appropriated to a *few*. See more of this in the former part of my Answer. We confess [that of *Salvian*, *That all mankind owe God for the death of Christ, for that there is no man* of mankind but shall be saved by Christs death, *if he believe*.] But all do not owe God for *grace to believe*; and *we* having had that happiness, which *others had not*, we owe him the *more*.

When Mr. *Playfer* bids us [take heed of the Pharisees form of thanks for graces, with comparisons to other folks, *Lord I thank thee I am not like other men, or like this*

[*this Publican*] we humbly conceive, this Doctrine prompts men to ſuch [graces] not ours. For if [man make himſelf to differ] then he is indeed ſomewhat *better* then *othermen*; but we, who ſay, we are by nature all as bad as the worſt, and ſhould have been ſo ſtill, had not God given us *that grace*, which *we* deſerved no more then the *worſt* of men, are far from being in danger of ſwelling into this Phareſaical form of Devotion. It is for them to beware of it, who find ſomewhat in *themſelves*, which made a *difference* betwixt *them* and *others*, when God gave but the *ſame* meaſure of grace *unto all*.

[Indeed (ſaith Mr. *P.*) as ſome put the caſe of mankind, like a Company of Rebels, out of whom the King chuſeth whom he pleaſeth to pardon, and executes the reſt with the ſword; thoſe pardon'd, owe more thanks for their pardon, and more thanks for culling them out that were like to the reſt in Rebellion. But the Scripture puts not the caſe ſo, but rather thus; God by the Goſpel, as a King, mercifully proclaims a general pardon to all the Company of Rebels in ſuch a County, upon condition, that he that comes in and yeilds his ſword, and takes at the Kings Pavilion, a Ticket of his pardon be free to go home and enjoy the ſtate of a good Subject, but they that ſtand out and refuſe his grace, be after ſuch a day, purſued with fire and ſword. They that ſubmit, magnifie the amplitude of the Kings mercy, ſorrow for ſuch as obſtinately ſtand out, juſtifies his execution done upon ſtubborn ungratefull Rebels.]

I anſwer 1 That [Gods *proclaiming* a pardon to *all* the Rebels in *one* County (as you put the caſe) and *not proclaiming* it to *any* in *another*] ſhews a *diſparity of his grace and mercy*, and not an equality of them to all, and ſurely God doth not proclaim a pardon to *all* the Rebels, yea nor to the *greateſt* part of Rebels in the *world*. The Goſpel is not preached to *all people*. 2. That [Gods proclaiming a pardon to *all* the Rebels in a *County*] would bring *none* in to [lay down their ſwords, and take a Ticket of pardon] unleſs God gave them *hearts* to ſubmit, this is that we ſay, that we owe God for giving us *hearts* to do it, whereas he is not ſo gracious to many others, who ſtand off, becauſe their conſciences charge them not, as guilty of ſo much Rebellion, nor liable to Gods wrath. We ſay, we owe God, not only for [proclaiming a pardon] but giving us a *will* to *accept* it.

[You think (ſaith Mr. *P.*) to win greater thanks to God, by amplifying his grace upon one conſideration, of ſparing ſome ſimply, but with prejudice to his truth, proclaimed to all; I think to win greater thanks to God, by amplifying his grace upon another conſideration, of ſparing all upon favourable conditions, according to the Goſpel.]

I anſwer 1. That we do not think to win thanks to God by pretending he ſpares any men ſimply, ſay we, he ſpares none but *believers*; and we ſay that he is ready to ſpare *all believers*; but we deny he hath proclaimed the Goſpel to *all*; nor doth Mr. *Playfer* deny, but [that there are multitudes in the world, to whom it is not proclaimed] now as *he* puts a difference between ſuch, *to whom God proclaims the Goſpel*, and ſuch *to whom he doth not proclaim it*, without any prejudice to the *mercy of God*; ſo the difference which we affirm that *God puts between thoſe to whom he proclaims the Goſpel*, giving to *ſome* faith, and not to *others*, caſts no aſperſion upon his *truth*. For he never ſaid he would give *all faith*, to whom he gave the *Goſpel*, albeit he promiſe to give *heaven* to every one to whom he ſhall give *faith*.

2. That whereas Mr. *Playfer* [thinks to win greater thanks to God by amplifying his grace, upon another conſideration, of ſparing *all*, upon favourable conditions, according to the Goſpel.] 1. He doth not pretend that God affords the Goſpel to all; 2. he diminiſheth the grace of God, in robbing it of the honour due to it, for being the *author of that condition*, on which God ſpares *believers*; that is, faith; ſhortly, we amplifie the grace of God, as aſcribing to it *the faith of all that are ſaved* (in this particular Mr. *Playfer* ſtreightens it) and ſaith, that for God to give *faith to ſome*, and thereupon *ſalvation*, is to be infititely *more* gracious, then to *promiſe ſalvation to all* upon *condition of faith*, without giving *faith*, which *without Gods gift*, *no* man can

attain to, and conſequently *every* man muſt periſh notwithſtanding the amplitude of that grace, which Mr. *P.* aſſerts. And thus do *we* ſhew, how men owe God thanks for their *faith*, as well as *ſalvation*. Mr. *Playfer* makes them debters to God for *ſalvation*, but not for *faith*, but gives them fair leave to take home the praiſe of *that* to *themſelves*.

To the 3. Mr. *P.* anſwereth [for matter of glorying, let this Rule ſtand firm, *Qui gloriatur in Domino glorietur*, *let him that glorieth glory in the Lord*, or let him not glory. Remember again, that the gifts of God are either *immediate*, proceeding from *himſelf alone*, as *Propheſie*, *Tongues*, &c. or *mediate*, and ſuch as proceed from *Gods grace* and *mans will* together. Of thoſe *immediate* gifts there is no *glorying*: But for gifts *mediate*, as *faith* and *repentance*, and *obedience* in any particular duty, they muſt be conſidered as *Dona Dei*, and as *debita à nobis*, as the gifts of God, and as our duties, things neceſſary upon Gods commandment, and the peril of our ſalvation. As Gods gifts, and as our duties, there is no matter of *glorying* in them; *accepiſſe* is not the only excluder of glory, *debuiſſe* is as much.] I anſwer, That *debuiſſe* is indeed an excluder of glorying *againſt God*, but not of glorying *above men*; and whereas Mr. *Playfer* asks [What matter of boaſting is it for a man to have kept himſelf from a deteſtable crime, whereinto another ruſhing, precipitates himſelf into hell?] I anſwer, It is matter of inſulting over the man, that ſo deſperately deſtroyes himſelf. Now whoever doth not ſo far *abaſe himſelf*, as to acknowledg, that without the grace of God reſtraining him, he ſhould have *ruſht as deſperately* as any *other*, on the moſt abominable wickedneſs, doth not give *that glory to God* as he *ought*, but takes *too much* to *himſelf*, and looking upon *himſelf* as *better* then *another* not made ſo *immediately* by God. The *glory* which we eſſay to give to God, is by *ſhaming* our *ſelves*, for an inclination to the *greateſt* ſins acted by the *worſt* men, and acknowledging that not only the *doing of our duties*; but the *not doing* the moſt abhorred wickedneſs, comes *wholly* and *entirely* from the *greater* and *more eſpecial goodneſs of God to us*: We do not only give God the glory of *all the little good* we do, as *who works it all in us*; but of this, that we are preſerved from the *greateſt evils*, which is only by the *peculiar influence of his grace*, mercifully preventing us, both for that *we are what we are* by his *grace*, and that *we are not* what the worſt of other men *are*, which we ſhould have *been without* his *grace*.

But ſaith Mr. *Playfer*, [I pray do not exclude all kind of glorying, not that which St. *Paul* names ſo, 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν αὕτη ἐστὶ, τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν, &c. The *teſtimony of a good conſcience* is ſome comfort, and ſome joy, which he wanteth who hath an evil conſcience.] It is ſo, and in that reſpect καύχησις, which is better rendred by *rejoycing* then *boaſting*. Yet let it be this is *our boaſting*, as the *Pſalmiſt*, *We boaſt of God all the day long*; and as *Eſay*, *In thy righteouſneſs will we make our boaſt*; *boaſt ſo*, as to *ſhame our ſelves*; *to thee O Lord belongeth glory*, *but to us ſhame and confuſion*, *which* ſhould have run to all extremity of *evil* as well as *others*; have thou *all* the glory of keeping us *from it*. Our conſciences muſt confeſs enough againſt *our ſelves* that we have been *kept from*; that *others* cannot tax us, it is thy *goodneſs*, and be it thy *glory*; it is enough that it is *our joy*: If it be well weighed, the Apoſtle forgets not to aſcribe it to *the grace of God* in the ſame breath, *by the grace of God we have had our converſation in the world*, and poſſibly he refers even *that* too in part to their *prayers*, *v.* 11.

Well, but [Let Innocence (ſaith Mr. *Playfer*) waſh her hands without a check of vainglory] let her fame *waſh her hands in innocence*, ſo ſhe do not take them in *applauſe to her ſelf*: let her *waſh her hands*, ſo ſhe remember to do it with a confeſſion that they are *fowl enough* in the *eyes of God*, when ſhe hath made them *faireſt* to the *eyes of men*. Let her *waſh her hands*, ſo that ſhe forget not to do it with her *tears*; and humbly confeſs, that when ſhe hath *waſht them moſt*, ſhe needs that God ſhould *wipe* them, or elſe her very *waſhing* will prove a *defiling*. We allow *innocence* to juſtifie her ſelf before *men*; what is that to glorying before God, or againſt men? She may be allowed to glory in her *ſufferings*, ſhe may not in her *actings*, unleſs it be when ſhe is enforced to become a *fool*, ſo far to *glory* in a modeſt *vindication of her ſelf*, as to bring

bring her *enemies* to an humble acknowledgment of their ſins, and both to *Gods glory*, who kept her *free* from the *ſin*, and makes them *ſorrowfull* for it.

Thus [Let *Samuel* call *witneſs* of his integrity] as Mr. *Playfer*, but ſo as he gives God the *glory of it*; and while he *profeſſeth* his *integrity* before *men*, as humbly *confeſs* his *failings* to *God*, and as thankfully *acknowledg* that it was God that was both the *Author and finiſher* of his *integrity*. It is one thing to ask whoſe Oxe or whoſe Aſs have I ſtolen? another to ſay *non peccavi*, either to the tenth, or the eight Commandment; and if *Samuel* were guilty of the breach of either (as I ſuppoſe Mr. *Playfer* durſt not have been his Compurgator) his calling *witneſs of his integrity* is no example of ſuch a *glorying* as falls under preſent conſideration. *Samuel* would have confeſt his *ſons ſins* might have been put upon *his account*; and that God might have proceeded in as much ſeverity againſt *him* for his *ſons iniquities* though *leſs*, as he did againſt *Eli* for his ſons *iniquities*. Though theſe were *greater*, yet were *Samuels* ſons *great* enough to have forfeited not only his *houſe*, but his *ſoul* to ruine: *Samuel* could not be too confident a boaſter of his *innocence*, as long as his ſons were *guilty*, their *ſins* were in ſome part his *fault*. Shortly, this of *Samuel* is a *vindication* of his *integrity* from the wretched calumnies of ſlanderers tongues; not as much as a compariſon of his *righteouſneſs* with any *other mans*, much leſs a *glorying* in it before *God*. Laſtly [Let *Nehemiah* have leave to record his own good deeds, *Neh.* 5.15. *The former Governors before me, had been chargeable to the people, even their ſervants bare rule over them; but ſo did not I, becauſe of the fear of the Lord.*] Here is nothing of *glorying*, but a ſeaſonable *vindication* of his innocence unjuſtly aſperſed by ſome of the *Jews*, as well as *Sanballat* and *Tobiah*. A propoſing of his *example* to move the *Jews* to deal mercifully with their brethren, a removal of an *Objection* of preſcription; others before them had taken increaſe that was no more warrant for them to do it, then it would have been for *Nehemiah* to plead the oppreſſions of his Tyrannical Predeceſſors. The fear of the Lord *kept him*, ſhould keep *them* from meting out ſuch hard meaſure to their brethren: When all is done, *Nehemiah* prayes God *to remember and ſpare him* notwithſtanding *all the good deeds he had done*, and would as readily have acknowledged that God had been *more gracious to him*, that made him *more zealous for God* then others, that whatever difference was between him and others, was *only of Gods putting*.

Having done with the three Particulars, Mr. *Playfer* comes next to give a *general* anſwer to theſe three Objections thus. [When things ſucceed well and proſperouſly unto us, whatſoever be our natural parts, whatſoever have been our induſtry, or our labour, more then others, who is ſo void of piety, or underſtanding, who doth not aſcribe his good ſucceſs unto God, the fountain of all good, and the univerſal, or principal cauſe of all happy ends?] Yes for faſhions ſake; but he who looks on God only as an *univerſal cauſe* which acts *indifferently*, as much as he pretends to aſcribe *all* to God, aſcribes *moſt* to himſelf, while God acts but as the Sun, an univerſal cauſe, though his beams be neceſſary to this, that *any tree* bears *fruit*, yet that *one* bears *apples*, where another bears but *acorns*, is from the particular nature of thoſe *trees*, more then the *Sun*. And while God acts but as the *fountain*, an univerſal cauſe, that one part of the ſtream drives a *Mill*, or waters a *Meadow*, another runs down into the Ocean, without being ſo well imployed, is from the husbandmans care and providence, not the fountains bounty. This acknowledging God the principal cauſe, as long as he is ſaid but to act *indifferently*, is but a complement: Man, though the *ſecond* cauſe, is that from whom the effect doth more *immediately* iſſue.

It is a ſorry honour that men give to God, when they aſcribe their [good ſucceſs to him] at ſuch a diſtance, as that their *own endeavours* have a far *nearer* influence on it. And yet ſave thoſe who profeſs to [make themſelves to differ] aſcribe the difference to themſelves, not to God; how full of [piety or underſtanding] they are, let others judg; nay Learned Mr. *Goodwin* hath made it his buſineſs, to ſhew that the *effects are more attributable to the ſecond cauſes then to the firſt*. And ſo the building of the houſe, the keeping of the City, the increaſing the field, comes more from mens more immediate then Gods remote indifferent influence: Shortly it is not

enough

enough to aſcribe the [happy ſucceſs to God, more then our ſelves] unleſs we aſcribe it to God, that their endeavours were *more* and *better*, not only more [*happy* and *ſucceſſull*, and give him the honour of our *works*, that we did it *better* then others, not only of the *iſſue*, that we received *more good* then others.

Mr. *Playfer* goes on [becauſe ſome little thing is done by men, but nothing comparable to that great which is done by God, therefore the form of the Saints rejoycing is thus conceived, *Not unto us O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory.* That *not unto us*, implies that *ſomething* hath been done by *us*; and that mans corrupt heart is too ready to claim *ſome glory to it ſelf for it*; but true wiſdom and piety ſoon removeth it, and ſaith, *not unto us, but to thy name give glory.*]

I reply, That according to *his* Doctrine, that [*great* thing which is done by *God*] is not ſo *much*, as that *little* which is done by *men*, for that [great thing which is done by God] borrows all its efficacy from that *little* thing which is done by man, whoſe little thing alone makes [Gods great thing] of any benefit to them; the ſame grace which God gives to two, of which one is converted, the other not, becomes to *one* vain, and renders him the more hardned, and would ſo to the *other*, but that *his own* husbandry of it makes it a bleſſing to him. And thus he owes the bleſſing not to *the grace*, which might have proved a *curſe*, but to his *own* managing of it; and accordly *doth more*, though in *doing leſs*. [That, not unto us, implies ſomething hath been done by *us*] is yeilded. *We* believe, repent, give glory to God, do good offices to men, *&c.* but we do *this* by a more potent work of Gods grace on *us*, then he exerted on *thoſe* who *did them not.* And this is the point in queſtion, not whether we do not do *ſomewhat more then others who do not thus?* but *whether God do not do more on us then them?* and *whether our doing more be not purely from his doing more to us?* *We* maintain the *affirmative*; and being conſcious to our ſelves how apt corrupt hearts are to claim ſome glory at leaſt to themſelves, that they are not *altogether* ſo corrupt as ſome *other mens*, we check them with *this*, that *all the difference is purely from Gods greater grace.*

Well, But [Mr. *Playfer* was by neceſſity compelled to ſpeak as he doth, by thoſe, who under a colour of magnifying the grace of God, and juſtly reproving thoſe, who are *Adulatores naturæ*, are turned themſelves, *Adulatores gratiæ*, ſo far forth, as by them, Satan ſeeketh to ſubvert the Truth and righteouſneſs of God, and to extinguiſh and deſtroy all Piety and Religion in men, bringing into the world a ſtupid ſloth for *ſome*, a remorſleſs infidelity and impenitency for *others*, and an invincible deſperateneſs and hardneſs for *other ſome.*]

I anſwer, 1. We would not lie for God himſelf, who is above all poſſibility of flattery. 2. We are not to account for [Satans endeavours] let him ſeek as much as he will to bring into the world all theſe, by *occaſion* of our *Doctrine*, as long as our *Doctrine* is not *acceſſary* to his endeavours, ſhe is no more chargeable with them, then the *Scriptures of God* are; for being abuſed ſometimes by Satan, ſometimes by his inſtruments, to the like purpoſes. The Devil hath ever eſſayed to draw *falſhood* out of *truth*; and to extract the moſt *poiſonous juice* out of the *ſweeteſt flowers*: Yea but Mr. *Playfer* adds [Theſe are the natural offſpring of that Doctrine, which takes away all manner of freedom of will from men, in mattets of ſalvation; that turns the general Promiſes of the Goſpel into particular and private, that limits an eſpecial kind of grace, which is only effectual to a few ſecret ones, by a direct decree, the reſt being left deſtitute of true grace, though they be called by the word of the Goſpel.

Say we, 1. This concerns not us; our Doctrine [takes not away all manner of freedom from men in matters of ſalvation] ſhe ſaith we believe *freely*, repent *freely*, do all we do *freely*, that is, *voluntarily*, not *compelled* from *without*, not *neceſſitated* by any thing *within our ſelves*; only ſhe ſaith, we act not *freely* till we be *freed* by God, from thoſe fetters and chains wherewith all our faculties are miſerably bouud, till he by his *eſpecial grace*, ſet us at liberty. We acknowledg we act *freely* in matters of *ſalvation*; we ſay but this, We are meerly paſſive when God *firſt* acts to our *converſion*; and that albeit we act *freely*, ere we come to *glory*, *grace* came in upon us, when had

had we been left at our *liberty*, we ſhould have as ſtoutly acted againſt it as *any others*, who are ſaid by Mr. *Playfer* to reſiſt, ſo as to put to *flight* as *great* a meaſure of grace as *prevailed upon us*.

2. Neither doth our Doctrine deſerve to be charged [with turning the general promiſes of the Goſpel into particular and private] ſhe ſaith as lowdly, as any, *Whoſoever believe ſhall be ſaved*, ſhe never heard where God promiſed to make *all men believers*, or *any but believers*, partakers of the *inheritance in heaven*.

For the 3. She yeilds [That ſhe teacheth there is an eſpecial kind of grace, which is only effectual to a few ſecret ones, to whom it was directly decreed, the reſt being left deſtitute of true grace, though called by the word of the Goſpel.]

But that *thoſe which you alleadg* are [the natural offſpring] of this poſition, ſhe juſtly *denies*, and is ready to *traverſe*.

And 1. She pleads, that this doth no way [ſubvert the truth and righteouſneſs of God:] not his truth, becauſe he no where promiſeth true grace to *all* men; if he have, ſhe challengeth any man to ſhew where; where ever God ſaid *he would give all men faith*, yea or the means of it; not his *righteouſneſs*, for he is no way obliged to give *any man*, much leſs *all men* theſe precious *jewels*: his ſpirit is not bound to *blow* but where *he liſts*.

2. She avers, that this doth not [extinguiſh and deſtroy all piety and religion in men.] For 1. There is not a little piety and religion to be ſeen in *thoſe* men who maintain this Doctrine. Yea where is *more* to be found, then in the Writings, Sermons, Converſations of thoſe holy men, who have made it their work to defend it, and confute the contrary? When all the malice of *Rome* and Hell have ſpit the worſt of their venom, nothing can ſtick on the faces of thoſe eminent Saints, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Twiſs*, *Perkins*, to name no more, whom the Church of God glories to acknowledg her Lights, and this Doctrine her Champions, who now lie all, as he ſaid of *Calvin*, under *Beatum ceſpitem Cui cuncta poſſint invidere marmora.*

2. This Doctrine hath not [extinguiſhed Piety and Religion] in thoſe who never embraced it, or who having once embraced, have afterwards diſclaimed it, and with it, for the moſt part of them, all the little Piety and Religion they ſeemed to have.

3. She denies 1. That [ſhe hath brought into the world, a ſtupid ſloath for ſome,] is this to make men ſloathfull, to tell them all they *can do*, will not do the work of their ſalvation, unleſs they pray God continually to do it for them? to tell them each idle word will condemn them, each work is idle till it be done as in Gods ſight, and to his glory, and that there is no doing any thing as they ought, till they do all they can to abhor themſelves, and begg Gods acceptance in Chriſt, and aſſiſtance by his ſpirit? 2. That [She hath brought a remorſleſs infidelity and impenitency for others.] Is that a reaſon why they ſhould not believe, becauſe without belief they ſhall be damnd, and that they cannot believe without Gods grace? If they *believe this*, they *believe*; if they do *not believe this*, *this* is not guilty of their *infidelity*.

If they *believe this*, they do of courſe repent of their *beſt works*, as *dead works*; if they do *not believe this*, this not being *believed*, is not guilty of their *impenitency*. 3. Thus ſhe hath not [brought an invincible deſperateneſs and hardneſs on any.] Thoſe that believe this, are made the ſofter. Prove who can, that this Doctrine being heartily embraced produceth any ſuch unhappy effects.

Mr. *Playfer* gravely concludes [He was long ſince warned of this by *Melanthon*.] I ſhall only refer my Reader to Doctor *Twiſs* in his Anſwer to Mr. *Hord*, p. 98. where he ſhal ſee *Melanthon* and *Calvin* very well agreed. And if the Reader will not take the pains to go further, he ſhall find enough to clear this in my Anſwer to Mr. *Goodwins* 15. Chapter.

SECT. 3.

You produce a ſecond Argument againſt the Doctrine of Perſeverance. [If the common Doctrine of Perſeverance, rendreth the Miniſtry of the Goſpel, ſo far as it concerneth the Perſeverance of the Saints, vain, impertinent and void, then is it not a Doctrine of God, but men, and conſequently that which oppoſeth it, is the truth. But certain it is, that the ſaid Doctrine is of this unchriſtian tendency, and import,

ergo.]

ergo.] Your Major is confeſſed to be [as clear as the Sun.] The Minor needs better proof then you are like to bring for it, as much as you labour for it even in the fire. That which you produce is this, [That Doctrine which rendreth the labour and faithfulneſs of a Miniſter, in preſſing ſuch exhortations, threatnings and promiſes, as tend to the preſervation of the Saints, in faith and holyneſs unto the end, uſeleſs, is not of God but men. But this doth the Doctrine of perſeverance, *ergo.*]

Your Major again is granted; your Minor muſt be content to be denyed. But you prove it thus, [The common Doctrine of Perſeverance requireth and commandeth all Saints, or true believers to be fully perſwaded, and that with the greateſt and moſt indubitable certainty of faith, that there is an abſolute and utter impoſſibility, either of a total or final defection of their faith, and that though they ſhould fall into ten thouſand enormous and moſt abominable ſins, and lie wallowing in them, like a ſwine in the mire, yet they ſhall remain all the while in an eſtate of grace, and that God wil by a ſtrong hand of irreſiſtible grace, bring them off from their ſins by repentance before they die. But that Doctrine which commandeth all this, and much more of like import, to be confidently believed by true believers, rendreth the preſſing of all exhortations, threatnings, promiſes upon them, in order to prevail with them, or to make them carefull to perſevere, bootleſs and unneceſſary. *Ergo.*]

1. The Major, *you* pretend to be [the known voice of the common Doctrine of Perſeverance.] *We* never heard her ſpeak like it: For 1. She doth not ſay there is [an abſolute and utter *impoſſibility*, of either a total or final defection of a Saints faith;] She ſaith, there is an abſolute *certainty* of it if he were left to himſelf, ſo many are his corruptions and infirmities. She avoucheth the *danger* of his Apoſtaſie in himſelf, as much as an *impoſſibility* of it in reſpect of *God.* 2. She doth not ſay that [though a Saint ſhould fall into ten thouſand enormous and moſt abominable ſins, and wallow in them like a ſwine in the mire, he ſhould continue in an eſtate of grace.] She ſaith he ſhall be *kept from falling* into *many* ſuch ſins, and from *wallowing* in *any.* Though *David* ſinned, and continued *long* without repentance, he did not ſo *long wallow* in the act of *ſin.* 3. She ſaith indeed, [That look into whatever ſins the Saint fall, he ſhall be brought to repentance before he die.] But his being brought to repentance, and that with an irreſiſtible hand, gives little encouragement to commit ſin, and leſs to continue in it. The thought of repentance is enough to fright him from it; the thought of the *bitterneſs* of repentance, is enough to diſreliſh all the *pleaſures* of ſin; the thought of *reſtitution*, to ſcare him from all the *profits* of ſin; the thought of the *ſhame* of repentance, to take him off from all temptations of *honour* by ſin. 4. She doth not uſe to apply her ſelf in this kind to a Saint, but when he is oppreſſed with the *paſſion of the heart*, and doubts he ſhall not be able to vanquiſh a temptation, but that he ſhall be *caſt down*, or being caſt down deſpaires in himſelf of ſtrength to *ariſe*, and diſquiets himſelf out of fear of himſelf, and hatred of ſin.

On ſuch occaſions ſhe minds him of Gods promiſe, to quicken his prayers, and to ſend him to God for grace; not to encourage him to keep off in a careleſs ſecurity. Shortly ſhe looks upon this, as the greateſt *means* to make him perſevere; and knows nothing ſo effectual to keep a Saint from ſin, and lead him to repentance after a ſin, as to poſſeſs him with, a ſenſe of a ſingular happineſs of *being kept from it*, or *drawn out of it*, and Gods *engagement* for his happineſs in this kind, and his *impotency* on his own part without God, and his *need* that God ſhould do it for him, by *no leſs* then an [*irreſiſtible* hand.]

You prevaricate in ſaying that [A certain knowledg and perſwaſion, that God will by an irreſiſtible hand of power, preſerve a man in the ſtate of grace, how deſperately, careleſs, negligent, or wicked ſoever he ſhall be, clearly diſſolves the uſefulneſs and neceſſity of all other means whatſoever, in reference to this end.] The Doctrine of Perſeverance is not wont to drawl after this looſe ſort. She ſaith that God will preſerve his Saints from being deſperately careleſs, negligent, and wicked, and endeavors to make the Saints look on this as an expreſſion of Gods eſpecial *mercy* to them, and expecting an eſpecial *thankfulneſs* from them. She doth not ſay [their Corn ſhall certainly proſper whether they wake or ſleep;] but that they ſhall *not ſleep* ſo

as

as to neglect the attendance of their Corn; which is neceſſary to its proſpering. I cannot but admire your confidence in ſaying, [this is a truth which prejudice and partiality, themſelves cannot lightly but ſubſcribe unto, *viz.* there is no force, power, or authority in ſuch an exhortation, wherein we are preſſed to uſe means, either for the avoiding or eſcaping of ſuch a danger, which we are upon ſure grounds perſwaded, cannot poſſibly fall upon us; or for the performance of what we are aſſured upon like terms of certainty, that we cannot but perform, or that God himſelf will certainly by an irreſiſtible and unfruſtrable hand of grace, perform and work in us.] For 1. We uſe not to ſay that the danger of Apoſtacy cannot poſſibly fall upon the Saints. We ſee they *daily* do Apoſtatize, though not *totally*, or *finally*; and adde, there is an *impoſſibility* to prevent even *that* too, were they ſupported by no greater power then their own. The ſame we ſay of their *perſeverance*, that they are far from not being able not to perform it, yea, that of themſelves they are *utterly unable*. The ſame we ſay of *threatnings* and *promiſes*, That we neither threaten the Saints a *danger* which they may infallibly know themſelves to be out of all *poſſibility* of ſuffering; nor promiſe them a *bleſſing* upon the performance of a condition which they may infallibly know to be theirs *without performance* of the Condition; albeit they well enough may *before* the performance of it, as that *God will enable them to perform it*. Theſe are all unworthy miſrepreſentations of our Doctrine; and indeed you do all along but rear up a *man of ſtraw*, and then ſhew your valour in beating him down.

You eſſay to overthrow what is uſually pleaded by us, [to ſalve the conſiſtency of our Doctrine with the uſefulneſs of exhortations, threatnings and promiſes,] and after your old faſhion, tell us, [It hath neither Logical, nor Theological vertue in it; to ſay as we do, that thoſe Exhortations, Comminations and Promiſes, are means appointed by God for the accompliſhing and effecting of that Perſeverance of the Saints, which he hath decreed to them,] and you attempt to ſhew it ſeverally, in each particular. SECT. 4.

1. For Exhortations, that they are no means whereby the Promiſes are accompliſhed or effected, you prove thus, [Whatſoever is a means to bring any thing to paſs, ought not to contain in it any thing repugnant, or contrary to that which is intended to be brought to paſs by it. But the Scripture *exhortations* unto perſeverance, contain that which is repugnant to the *Promiſes* of perſeverance, if ſuppoſed ſuch as our Adverſaries ſuppoſe them to be: therefore they can be no means to effect thoſe Promiſes. The *Minor* you prove thus, ſuch exhortations as theſe unto the Saints, *Take heed leſt there be at any time an evil heart of unbelief in you, leſt you be hardned through the deceitfulneſs of ſin; leſt you fall from grace; leſt you receive the grace of God in vain; leſt you fall from your own ſtedfaſtneſs*; in their nature and proper tendency, import a danger, and ſerve to raiſe a fear in men, leſt the danger imported ſhould come upon them; whereas ſuch promiſes as theſe, made unto the ſame perſons, and that unconditionally, as is ſuppoſed, that *there ſhall never be an heart of unbelief in you, that you ſhall never be hardned through the deceitfulneſs of ſin*; that *you ſhall never fall away from the grace of God*, &c. exclude all danger, yea or poſſibility of falling away, and tend directly to prevent or extinguiſh all fear in men, of any ſuch danger. Therefore ſuch exhortations are in their very natures and genuine imports, contrary to ſuch promiſes in theirs, and conſequently can be no means of bringing them to paſs.]

I anſwer, 1. That you are guilty of a Paralogiſm, in ſaying, [The exhortations can be no means of bringing the Promiſes to paſs,] if you mean of bringing it to paſs that *ſuch promiſes are made*; no man ever ſaid, *Theſe exhortations were means of bringing them to paſs* in *that ſenſe*. If you mean of bringing it to paſs, that *ſuch promiſes are made good*, there is nothing in thoſe exhortations *contrary or repugnant to the making good of ſuch promiſes*: for they *exhort* to the ſame thing which is *effected* when theſe *promiſes are made good*.

2. Theſe Exhortations and Promiſes, take them how you will, have nothing [repugnant each to other:] For let the [import of the Exhortations be to raiſe fear

of falling away; that of the Promiſes to prevent and extinguiſh fear of ſuch danger.] The *fear* intended to be *raiſed* by the Exhortations, is in reſpect of our *own corruptions* and *frailties*, the *fear* intended to be *prevented* and extinguiſhed by the Promiſes, is in reſpect of *Gods forgetting to be ſo gracious* as to ſubdue our corruptions, and heal our frailties. Now the *raiſing* of fear in the one reſpect, and the *extinguiſhing* fear in the other, have no repugnancy at all. A fear in regard of *our ſelves*, a fearleſſneſs in regard of *God*, may very fairly accord and conſiſt together.

3. We know no ſuch Promiſes as thoſe you mention, as pretended by us; *There ſhall never be in you an heart of unbelief; you ſhall never be hardned through the deceitfulneſs of ſin; you ſhall never fall from grace.* *We* ſay there is in *every child* of God, an heart of *too much unbelief*, and *they* all ſay, *Lord we believe, help our unbelief.* *We* ſay that *every child* of God hath ever and anon his *heart hardned from Gods fear*; and *they* as ſadly bewail it: *Why haſt thou made us to erre from thy precepts, and hardned our hearts from thy fear?* *We* ſay, *Every child* of God falls at every turn from the *grace of God* in *part*, though neither *totally* nor *finally*; and *they* have all the grace to acknowledg it in all humility. We know no ſuch Promiſes as theſe extant in Scripture; nor are there any Promiſes there mentioned, which tend to prevent or extinguiſh *all fears in men of ſuch dangers.* The greateſt promiſes are, that they ſhall not *periſh in ſuch dangers*, applying themſelves unto *God*; and thoſe *Promiſes* ſtirr them up to *perfect holineſs in the fear of God.* Is a Promiſe that God will *help them out of danger*, a ſecuring them that *they ſhall not fall into it*? Doth that Promiſe which gives them hope they ſhall *riſe*, aſcertain them they ſhall *not fall*? Alas, Sir, the Promiſes in Scripture give *no hope*, but in caſe of *fear*: no hope in *God* longer then they fear *themſelves*; they give them no *ſecurity* but in caſe of a *holy ſuſpicion of themſelves*: They give them no aſſurance of *relief* by the *ſpirit* of God, but in a continual *jealouſie* over their own *fleſh*. And thus is there no ſuch repugnancy as you pretend, between theſe *Exhortations* and the *Scripture Promiſes.* Yea, the *Scripture Promiſes* are the grounds of theſe *Exhortations*, *Work out your own ſalvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his own good pleaſure. God is faithfull, who will not ſuffer you to be tempted above that you are able to bear, but will with the temptation, alſo make* a way *to eſcape, that ye may be able to bear it; wherefore my dearly beloved flee from Idolatry.* Thus do theſe *Promiſes* ſerve for *motives* to back theſe *Exhortations*; theſe *Exhortations* do not run and daſh againſt the face of theſe *Promiſes.*

Again ſay you, [If ſuch Exhortations as we ſpeak of, be a means to effect ſuch Perſeverance, which our Adverſaries ſuppoſe to be promiſed to the Saints, then muſt the Act of Perſeverance in the Saints neceſſarily depend upon them, ſo as that it cannot, or will not take place, or be effected without them; *i. e.* without the Saints ſubmitting themſelves unto them. But Perſeverance upon theſe terms, clearly ſuppoſeth a poſſibility of non perſevering; for whatſoever dependeth upon a mutable condition, and which may poſſibly not be performed, may it ſelf as poſſibly never come to paſs.]

I yield that [Perſevering upon theſe terms, clearly ſuppoſeth a *poſſibility of non perſevering*;] but upon *ſuch terms*; and [that this *Condition* being *mutable*, the *perſevering* depending upon it, may *poſſibly* not come to paſs;] but he who hath decreed to *make his Saints perſevere*, hath decreed to *give them grace* to perform the *Condition neceſſarily required to their perſevering*: and though it be *mutable* in reſpect of the Saints *themſelves*, yet is it ordained by an *immutable decree of heaven*, and ſo is *immutable* ſo far; and ſo is the *perſeverance of the Saints*, and no further. You abuſe us and your Reader throughout, when you bear him in hand, we hold an *abſolute impoſſibility* of the Saints Apoſtatizing *totally* and *finally*. *We* affirm (you may know hereafter) *an abſolute impoſſibility of their perſevering*, as of themſelves, only we are bold to affirm, that that which is impoſſible *to be* in reſpect of *themſelves only*, is impoſſible *not to be* in reſpect of the purpoſes and promiſes of *God*, and his infinite *power* and *faithfulneſs* to fulfill them.

SECT. 5. [If it be ſaid that the ſaid Exhortations are means of the Saints perſevering in this reſpect

respect, *viz.* because God by his spirit irresistibly, or infrustrably draws and perswades the Saints to obey these exhortations, as means of their persevering. You answer,

1. That it cannot be proved that God doth draw or perswade his Saints upon any such terms, to obey these exhortations.] That is but said; [nay frequent experience sheweth, and our Adversaries own Doctrine expresly granteth, the Saints many times are so far from obeying these exhoreations, that they walk for a long time in full opposition to them, as in security, loosness, vile practises, &c.] What if they do? We say they are brought to obey them *at last*; and so though they walk *awhile* in opposition, they are at length brought by the spirit of God to *conformity* to them. When you tell us [we have not yet proved, nor ever will, but that they may walk, yea and many do, in full opposition to them to their dying day:] We yield still, they *may* and will walk so, if left to *themselves*; but that any *have so walked*, it is your part to demonstrate. *Affirmanti incumbit probatio.* You proceed next to a most Philosophical discussion of the manner, wherein Exhortations work upon the soul.

2. Say you, [If God by his spirit irresistibly draws his Saints to obey the Exhortations we speak of, he thus draweth them, either by such a force or power immediately acted upon their wills, by which they are made willing to obey them; or else he makes use of the said exhortations so to work or affect their wills, that they become willing accordingly.] He doth both, as absurd consequences as you are pleased to fasten on either.

1. If the *former* be asserted, then say you,

[1. The said Exhortations are no means whereby the Perseverance of the Saints is effected, but God alone, and immediately by his spirit: For if the will be immediately affected by God, after such a manner, or brought to such a bent and inclination, as that it cannot but obey the said Exhortations, *i. e.* do the things which the said Exhortations require, then would it have done the same things, whether there had been any such exhortations in being, or no; and consequently these Exhortations could have no manner of efficiency about their Perseverance: For the Will, according to the common saying, is of it self, *Cæca potentia*, a blind faculty, and follows its own predominant bent and inclination, without taking knowledg whether the wales or actions towards which it stands bent, be commanded, or exhorted unto by God, or no.]

I Answer, That the Exhortations are *means*, and yet God *alone*, and *immediately* by his spirit, *effects* the Perseverance of the Saints: For that though the *will* be *immediately* affected by God, yet that doth not hinder but that exhortations work on the *understanding* in their way. The *understanding* works not so on the *will*, but that the *will* hath a power to *suspend* its act, any determination of the understanding notwithstanding: For albeit the *will* cannot will any thing *contrary* to the *determination of the understanding*, yet hath she a power *not to will* the *determination of the understanding* notwithstanding. It is one thing *velle*, another *non velle*; one thing *velle aliud*, another *non velle hoc*. The Exhortations may so work on the *will*, as that she may not, *velle aliud*, or *nolle hoc*, which the understanding represents as good and meet; and yet she may *non velle hoc*, and that she doth *velle hoc*, comes from an *immediate work of God* upon the *will*; so that the exhortations are still *means*, as to the *understanding*, for its apprehending the thing represented by these exhortations, and the *understanding* having so apprehended the thing, works so far upon the *will*, as to restrain her from *nolle hoc* (and *velle aliud*) yet not so far, but that ere the will do *velle hoc*, God must come in by an *immediate work* upon her. Nor doth God so come in by an *immediate work upon the will*, but that still she may *not* obey the exhortations; that is, she hath a power in *sensu diviso*, *not to obey them*, though she hath not a power *not to obey them* in *sensu composito*. And he is so far from working so on the *will*, as that the *will* would (such a work of his supposed) have done the thing whether the exhortations had been or no; as that the will hath still a power *sensu diviso*, even these exhortations working on the *understanding*,

and Gods working on the *will*, notwithſtanding, *not to do* the thing; but ſhe hath *no power to do the thing*, by any work of God on her ſelf *immediately*, without ſome previous work on the *underſtanding*. For the *Will* being *caca potentia*, cannot be led to *will any thing* but what the Underſtanding *apprehends good*. Bent and Inclination in *it ſelf* it hath none to one thing more then another, but as it is apprehended by the *Underſtanding*. And it were ſtrange ſhe ſhould have a *bent* to ought that is *unknown*; *Ignoti nulla cupido*. Yea, ſhe hath *no bent* to that which is *known*, diſtinct from the *act of willing*. All the *choices of the will*, though *formally* in her *ſelf*, are rightly ſaid to be *radically* in the *underſtanding*. She follows the underſtanding, it is true, without taking *knowledge* her ſelf, which being *caca potentia* ſhe cannot do; but ſhe doth not follow the underſtanding further then the *underſtanding takes knowledge*: And when the underſtanding takes moſt knowledge, ſhe *may not follow*; and in the particulars whereto God exhorts, ſhe *would not follow*, notwithſtanding all the ducture of the underſtanding, did not *God immediately* work upon her by his Spirit. So then *Exhortations* are neceſſary in regard of the *underſtanding*; the *underſtandings apprehenſion* is neceſſary, that the *Will* may be in a capacity to *will* what the exhortations *require*; the *Spirit of Gods work upon the Will* is neceſſary, that ſhe may not *non velle*, which ſhe *may do* elſe, yea and *would*, all the apprehenſion of the underſtanding *non obſtante*. And thus it appears that there are neceſſarily required both *exhortations* as to the *underſtanding*, and the immediate influence of Gods Spirit as to the *will*, after thoſe exhortations; and that God works *immediately* upon the *will*, and yet works by *means* upon the *underſtanding*.

Et quæ non proſunt ſingula, multa juvant.

And thus your Argument wherein you repoſe ſo much confidence, is come to nothing: And it may very well be, yea neceſſarily muſt be ſaid, that Exhortations are means; and yet God by his Spirit works immediately, to the effecting of the Saints Perſeverance. Exhortations are *means* as to the *underſtanding*, without which the will *cannot work*. Gods Spirit working immediately on the will is as neceſſary, without which the will *may, not work*, all apprehenſions of the underſtanding notwithſtanding.

Now becauſe you ſeem to glory in this your Argument, (and I confeſs it contains much which is ſpecious in the eyes of a vulgar Reader, and my Anſwer hath as much in it which lies out of the reach of common intellectuals) I will be content to deſcend from Generalities, and to exemplifie this which I have ſaid in an eminent *Particular*. Suppoſe then a man be called to die for Chriſt; ere he be willing to reſign his life rather then to renounce Chriſt, 1. There is a neceſſity that he ſhould apprehend, firſt, the *inconſiderable* benefit he ſhall get by preſerving his *life* with the loſs of *Chriſt*, and conſequently of his *ſoul*; ſecondly, the *incomparable* benefit he ſhall get by keeping his intereſt in *Chriſt*, and conſequently attaining to the *eternal ſalvation* of his *ſoul*, though it coſt him his *life*. Againſt both theſe the world is apt to ſuggeſt many a great objection. Therefore, 2. there is need of exhortations, arguments, and anſwers. *Anſwers* to the objections, whereby the *vanity* of the things of *this life*, the *glory* of that *to com*, may be cleared to him: *Arguments*, whereby the *certainty* of loſing his ſoul, in caſe he ſave his life upon ſuch unworthy terms as the denial of Chriſt; and the *certainty* of ſaving his ſoul, in caſe he lay down his life in an holy dependance on Chriſt, may be demonſtrated to him. This being done, and the *Underſtanding* being now ſatisfied, yet the *Will* is not preſently brought to yield; but though ſhe cannot *will* the renouncing of Chriſt to ſave his life, yet ſhe ſtands mammmering, and the man is not brought to yield to lay down his life to keep his intereſt in Chriſt, and yet will not hear to loſe his intereſt in Chriſt to ſave his life:

——— Anxius hæret;
Incipit, & dubitat; ſcribit, deletque tabellas,
Et notat, & damnat, mox quæ dammaverat addit.

Here

Here 3. is a neceſſity of the work of the *Spirit of God* upon his *will* to take off this *ſuſpenſion*, and bring her to embrace death, and to welcom the croſs or the Stake. The *Exhortations* are means, *without which* the *Underſtanding* would not have been qualified to *apprehend* the *laying down* of life in this caſe as *reaſonable*. The *Apprehenſion of the Underſtanding* is neceſſary to lead the *Will* to *conſent* to the *laying down of life* in this caſe: The *Spirit of God working upon the Will*, is as neceſſary to keep the will from *not revoking* her aſſent, and drawing back in the very nick. The *Underſtanding* cannot *apprehend* without *exhortations*; the *Will* cannot *follow* without the leading of the *underſtanding*; the Will cannot *hold on*, but would, though not *retreat*, yet *ſtand ſtill*, without the overruling of the *Spirit of God*; the Spirit of God works *immediately* upon the will, for ſo much as the taking off the *reſtineſs* of it, that it makes not a *ſtand*, that it goes not *back*. Take it

By a *Simile*. A Boy which knows not the way, is to lead a Blind man to ſuch a place, ſuppoſe ſome great mans houſe: That the Blind man may come thither, it is neceſſary firſt that the *Boy* be *inſtructed* in the way; He is as the *underſtanding*. Secondly, that the *Boy lead the blind man*; who though he do not *ſee*; yet *follows* right as if he did *ſee* by the Boys *eyes*; He is as the *will*. But upon a ſudden, though he cannot *go* forward *without the Boy*, nor backward neither, yet he may *ſtand ſtill*, as not being *ſatisfied* that he is in the right way, yea and bid the Boy *ſit down* till he be better informed; and when the Boy is informed, yet he may *ſtand ſtill* as being *weary*. To carry him on now, here is required not only a full information of the *Boy*, but a renewing of the *Blind* mans *ſtrength*. Thus beſides the work of *Exhortations* on the *Underſtanding*, and the *Underſtandings* working on the *Will*, which puts it into ſuch a poſture that it cannot *go back*; yet that it may go *forward*, there is required a particular *work* of the Spirit of God upon the *Will*. And thus to the effecting of the Saints perſeverance, God both uſeth *means* for *one* part, and yet works *immediately* by his Spirit for *another*. And ſo your firſt Argument hath done its beſt, and as my Country-neighbours ſay, never the nearer. I am bold to ſay, Never did man write in more pomp then you, to ſo little purpoſe. Come we to

The ſecond. [If the will of a Saint be immediately ſo affected by God, that it ſtands inclined and bent to do the things which are proper to cauſe him to perſevere, then is this bent and inclination wrought in the will of ſuch a perſon after his being a Saint, and conſequently is not eſſential to him as a Saint, but meerly accidental and adventitious. And if ſo, then is there no inclination or bent in the will of a Saint, as ſuch, or from his firſt being a Saint, to perſevere, or to do the things which accompany perſeverance; but they come to be wrought in him afterwards. Which how conſiſtent it is with the principles of either Reaſon or Religion, I am content that my adverſaries themſelves ſhall judge.]

I anſwer, 1. by diſtinguiſhing of [the bent or inclination wrought in the will of a Saint] that it is either *habitual*, or *actual*; and ſay, *both* are *immediately* wrought by *God*: But the *habitual* bent, when *firſt* God makes a man a *Saint*; the *actual* afterwards upon occaſion: That the *habitual* bent is *eſſential* to a Saint, the *actual accidental*; and though the *actual* be *accidental* and *adventitious*, yet is there an *habitual* bent or inclination in the will of a Saint as *ſuch*, and from his *firſt* being a Saint. Now I beſeech you what is there in this, that is [inconſiſtent with the principles of either Reaſon or Religion?] I ſhall ſalve the conſiſtencie of it with both, thus. 1. By a *Simile*. A *Fruit-tree*, as ſoon as it is a *Fruit-tree*, hath a *natural bent* or *inclination* to *bear fruit* according to its kind; yet that it *actually bears fruit*, there is required an *actual influence* of the *Sun*, and *watering* of the *Clouds*. This *latter* is *accidental* and *adventitious*, yet *without this* cannot the Tree *bear fruit*; and yet ſtill even *without this* the Tree hath a *natural bent and inclination* to *bear fruit* according to its kind. Thus a Saint, as ſoon *as he is ſuch*, hath as *ſuch* an *eſſential bent and inclination* to Perſeverance; yet this *eſſential bent* and *inclination* notwithſtanding, he hath need of being *actually wrought on* by the Spirit of God bending and inclining him. A *bow* as a *bow* hath a *bending*, which I might call natural; yet muſt it be bent *actually*, beſides and beyond its natural *bending* as a *bow*, ere it be *fit for*. A *man* hath

as a *man* a *natural bent and inclination* to *reasoning*; will you deny the neceſſary concurrence of God to the *act of mans reasoning*? I ſhould think it were [very inconſiſtent with the principles of Reaſon] to ſay, a *man*, a *ſecond cauſe*, can act without the concurrence of *God* the *firſt*. And all as [inconſiſtent with the principles of Religion] to ſay that a *Saint* can do any action that is *Saint-like*, without the *eſpecial concurrence* of God. No Saints that I know of, beſides thoſe of your new Canonization, are ſo eminently *independent*.

Enter your third Reaſon. [If God doth immediately, and irreſiſtibly incline or move the wills of the Saints to do the things which accompany Perſeverance, the ſaid Exhortations can be no means of effecting this Perſeverance; for the will being phyſically and irreſiſtibly acted and drawn by God to do ſuch and ſuch things, needs no addition of moral means, ſuch as Exhortations are, if they be any, in order hereunto. What a man is neceſſitated unto, he needs no further help, or meanes to do it.]

I anſwer, The *Exhortation* is *before* the *irreſiſtible* work of the Spirit of God; and the *irreſiſtible work* of the Spirit of God is to *bring* the *Will* to do the thing whereunto elſe the *Exhortation* would of itſelf *not be able* to lead it. The *Exhortation* is as the Inſtrument which makes the *Mortuiſe*; the *irreſiſtible work* of the Spirit of God is, as it were, to put the Will (as I may ſay) *into the Mortuiſe*; the *Mortuiſe* would never *draw* the *Tenuer* unto it, nor the *Tenuer* fall into the *Mortuiſe*, without a *higher power* then its own. The *Exhortation* is neceſſary as to the *work of the Will*, to the *irreſiſtible work of the Spirit of God* it is not: But the *irreſiſtible work* of the Spirit of God being an *irreſiſtible leading of the Will*; and the Will being *to be led* to ſuch or ſuch a point, and that by the *Underſtanding*; there is a neceſſity of an Exhortation to direct the *Underſtanding* whither to lead the *Will*; and of an *irreſiſtible* work of the Spirit of God upon the *Will*, which without ſuch a work would not *follow* the Underſtanding, but frowardly *ſtand off*. Again I will yield you, [that *what* a man is *neceſſitated* to do, he needs no further help or means to do it] but the irreſiſtible work of the Spirit of God doth neceſſitate but to *one* act, and to *that* there is *no more need of exhortation* after ſuch an *irreſiſtible work of the Spirit of God*. There may be though to *other* acts: And there being required a *continuation* of acts of *ſeveral ſorts*, there is ſtill need of *exhortations* previous to the *irreſiſtible work of the Spirit of God on the will* in order to *each* of them, and the *continuation* of them reſpectively.

4. And laſtly ſay you, [The things which accompany Perſeverance import a continuance in faith, and love unto the end. If then the wills of the Saints be immediately and irreſiſtibly moved by God thus to continue, I mean in faith and love unto the end, what place is there for Exhortations to come in with their efficieneie towards their Perſeverance? Need they be exhorted to continue in faith and love, or to perſevere after the end?]

I anſwer, That the *wills of the Saints are immediately and irreſiſtibly moved by the Spirit of God to continue in faith and love to the end*: But though they *continue to the end*, they do not *continually act all along till the end*. Now there is need of Exhortations, not to exhort them to continue in faith and love, or to perſevere *after the end*, (as your ſubtilty is pleaſed ſomwhat jocundly to put it upon us) but to exhort them to *act all along* as occaſion preſents itſelf *till the end*. The irreſiſtible work of the Spirit of God, though it preſerves the Saints from falling *at the end*, yet it doth not from falling *many times before the end*: And when they *fall*, there is uſe of exhortations to make them *ariſe*; and when they are *riſen*, there is the ſame uſe of them to *keep them from falling again*, and to put them on *walking uprightly* and *wiſely*. The work of the Spirit of God is, ſuch as is not quite *omitted* or *laid* utterly aſide *till the end*; it is often *interrupted*, and varies in the *mean time*; and whenſoever it is moſt *prevalent*, it ſtill proceeds in ſuch a way as is *proportionable* to the nature of a *rational creature*, and ſo leads the will only ſo far as the *underſtanding* directs; but the underſtanding doth it *inſufficiently*, and not *efficaciouſly* enough to overcome the ſturdineſs of the *will*, till the *work of the Spirit of God* come in, and make all ſure.

And

And thus we ſee that there is no ſuch inconſiſtency, as Sir, your Reverence hath pretended between the *immediate work* of the ſpirit of God upon the *will*, and his uſing *exhortations* as *means* in the work, *viz.* upon the *underſtanding*. Proceed we now to examin your attempt againſt what is uſually ſaid of Gods uſing exhortations to influence, or affect the wills of the Saints, as hereby to make them infallibly, infruſtrably, neceſſitatingly willing to perſevere, or to do the things upon which Perſeverance dependeth.

If ſo ſay you, [Then one and the ſame act of the Will ſhould be both Phyſical and Moral, and ſo be ſpecifically diſtinguiſhed, in and from it ſelf: for ſo far as it is produced by the irreſiſtible force or Power of the Spirit of God, it muſt needs be Phyſical, the ſaid irreſiſtible working of the Spirit being a Phyſical action, and ſo not proper to produce a Moral effect. Again, as far as Exhortations are means to produce or raiſe this act of the will, or contribute any thing towards it, it muſt needs be morall, becauſe Exhortations are morall cauſes, and ſo not capable of producing naturall, Phyſicall, or neceſſary effects. Now then, if it be impoſſible, that one and the ſame act of the will, ſhould be both Phyſicall and Morall, that is neceſſary, and not neceſſary; impoſſible alſo it is, that it ſhould be produced by the irreſiſtible working of God, and by Exhortations in a joint efficiency.] SECT. 6.

I anſwer, there is no ſuch abſurdity as you pretend, in ſaying the ſame act may be both *Phyſicall* and *Morall*; and *though* [the *Phyſicalneſs* and *Morality* of the action be indeed *ſpecifically* diſtinct] yet may they both dwell together in one and the ſame act, without [making *it* ſpecifically *diſtinct* in and from it ſelf] juſt as *whiteneſs*, and *length* and *breadth* are accidents *ſpecifically diſtinct*, yet doe they not render that *Body* wherein they reſide ſpecifically *diſtinct*, *in* and from it ſelf. Or if you will, as *morality* and *religiouſneſs* are *ſpecifically diſtinct*, yet doe not they make the *ſame action*, where they often both meet, *inſpecifically diſtinct in and from it ſelf*. An action is ſaid to be *Phyſical* in regard of the *Principle* from which it proceeds; it is ſaid to be *Moral* in regard of the *Rule* according to which it proceeds: even when I *eat or drink*, thoſe actions are *Natural*, and yet *Moral* too: *Natural* in reſpect of the *Cauſe* from which they iſſue; *Moral* in reſpect of the *Law* whereby they are ordered, my eating or drinking being not to *exceſs* or *riot*, not meerly to pleaſe my *appetite*, but to fit me for the ſetting upon my *work* again with ſo much the more *alacrity*, to the *glory* of God, and the benefit of mine *own* ſoul and *others*. So then let the ſame act of the Will be yielded to be both *Phyſical* and *Moral*: I know nothing that follows from it of ſo perilous conſequence, as [that it is ſpecifically diſtinguiſhed in and from it ſelf] *Phyſicalneſs* and *Morality* in the *abſtract*, are *ſpecifically* diſtinguiſhed; an act *Phyſical* and *Moral* in the *concrete* is not ſo. It ſufficeth that the *ſame act* undergoes *ſeveral conſiderations*, according to the *ſeveral reſpects* it bears; and is *Natural* as to *one*, the *Cauſe* from which it *depends*, *Moral* in *another*, the *Canon* by which it is *directed*: And thus the *ſame act* as wrought by the influence of the *Spirit of God*, may be ſaid, as you call it, to be *Phyſical*, as wrought according to the tenor of *Exhortations*, *Moral*. Yea but [*Phyſical* and Moral ſignifie as much as neceſſary, and not neceſſary;] and ſo the ſame act cannot be capable of two ſuch contradictory denominations. Nay by your leave, 1. Nothing hinders but that the ſame act may be *neceſſary* in *one* reſpect, and *not neceſſary* in *another*; as when a *ſtrong* and *irreſiſtible* Agent makes a *weaker* to work, the *working of the weaker* is neceſſary in reſpect of that *higher Cauſe*; yet not neceſſary ſtill in reſpect of the *Subject*. Like as they were wont to ſay of an Eclipſe, it is *neceſſary the Sun or Moon ſhould be Eclipſed at ſuch or ſuch a time*; neceſſary it *is not* in reſpect of the *Subject*, elſe the Sun and Moon ſhould be *alwaies* eclipſed; it is neceſſary in reſpect of the *Cauſe*, the conſtant revolutions of the Heavens. 2. As the ſame act may be ſaid to be *neceſſary* in reſpect of the *Cauſe*, when yet it is *not* neceſſary in reſpect of the *Subject*: So may it be ſaid to be *neceſſary* in reſpect of *one* Cauſe, and *not* neceſſary in reſpect of *another*: And ſo the *ſame act of the Will* may be both *neceſſary* in reſpect of the *irreſiſtible working* of Gods Spirit, and *not neceſſary* in reſpect of the *reſiſtible* working of *Exhortations*, and their Contributions towards it, which yet are *neceſſary*, though they *act not neceſſarily*; ſo as that though *they* may *fail to produce ſuch an effect*, yet

ſuch

ſuch an effect cannot be produced in caſe they *fail*; and God in the *working* of his Spirit doth as it were accommodate himſelf to *Exhortations*, and doth not work ordinarily but according to their *meaſure* and *gage*.

3. Whether God work *irreſiſtibly*, or *no*, I ask, doth he work at all *phyſically* (as you call it) upon the will ſo as to produce the action? If he *do*, as moſt others will grant, and for ought I can ſee you have no mind to deny at preſent, then ſtill the action of God is *phyſical*, though *reſiſtible*; and ſo the act of the *will* will be ſo far *phyſical* as well as *moral*, though not *neceſſary* and *unneceſſary*: And then if it be *phyſical*, yet *not neceſſary*, then is not *every phyſical* act, as phyſical, ſo *neceſſary*, that it may not be allowed to be ſo far *not neceſſary* as is ſufficient to entitle it *moral*. And thus you do avoid this pretended abſurdity no better then your adverſaries. And the truth is, your ſtrugling to get out of theſe briars, doth but entangle you ſo much the faſter; and your Anſwer by which you endeavour moſt induſtriouſly to extricate your ſelf, doth but involve you the more.

Say you, [Though ſuch an operation of God upon the will, as is here mentioned, be in reſpect of God, and the manner of its proceeding from him, Phyſical; yet in reſpect of the nature and ſubſtance of it, it is properly moral; becauſe it impreſſeth or affecteth the will upon which it is acted, after the manner of moral cauſes, properly ſo called, *i.e.* perſwadingly, not raviſhingly, or neceſſitatingly.]

I reply, That no operation of God *immediately upon the will* can affect the will *perſwadingly*; for that whatever works *perſwadingly*, worketh by *argument*; but the *will* is not of it ſelf capable of an *argument*, as being (as you ſaid rightly erewhiles) *cæca potentia*, a *blind faculty*. Well God may work upon the *will mediately* by Argument miniſtred to the *underſtanding*; to which God may *immediately* repreſent what Arguments, Reaſons, Motives, Inducements he pleaſeth, but the *Will* not being capable of any *argument*, *reaſon*, *motive*, or *inducement*, cannot be wrought upon *immediately* by any operation of God *perſwadingly*: But if he work upon the *will*, it muſt be meerly *Phyſically*, and by making ſuch an impreſſion upon it, as it is not *capable of reſiſting*: For look as far as it doth *reſiſt the impreſſion*, the impreſſion is *not made upon it*; and if the impreſſion *be not made upon it*, then God impreſſeth nothing, and ſo *works nothing*; and as far as an *impreſſion is made*, that impreſſion is made in a meer *Phyſical way*, and not as you ſpeak [Perſwadingly.] The illuſtration which you ſubjoyn, leaves us as much in the dark as we were before. [When a Miniſter, ſay you, in his Preaching, preſſeth, or perſwades men to ſuch and ſuch duties or actions, this act, as it proceeds from him, I mean as it is raiſed by his natural abilities of underſtanding and ſpeaking, is Phyſical or Natural; but in reſpect of the ſubſtance, or native tendency of it, it is clearly Moral, becauſe it tends to incline the wills of men to ſuch or ſuch Elections, without neceſſitating them thereunto; and ſo comports with thoſe Arguments or Exhortations in their manner of efficiency, by which he preſſeth or moveth them to ſuch things.]

I anſwer 1. That there is no correſpondency between a *Miniſters Preaching*, and *Gods operation* upon the will: A Miniſter works even upon the *underſtanding* but *mediately*; and his action muſt borrow leave of the *ear*, before it can have any entrance into the *Underſtanding*; but God is ſuppoſed by you, to act immediately upon the *Will*, and to make I know not what [perſwading impreſſion upon it.] 2. The *Miniſters* action, [as it is raiſed by his underſtanding and ſpeaking, is indeed natural;] but the morality of it lies in the *force of the Arguments* fitted to the underſtanding of the *hearer*: and as for the *manner of his elocution*, which may catch the *fancy*, and his *pronounciation* which may take the *ear*, and perhaps his *geſture*, which may win the *eye* of the hearer; all theſe three laſt, are but for the conveyance of his *Arguments* with the more plauſibleneſs into the thoughts and apprehenſions of the *hearer*, and ſo to his *affections*. The *energy of his action*, lies in the *convincingneſs of thoſe Reaſons* which are thus preſented to the *Hearers underſtanding*; and ſo he is ſaid to act *morally*, in this reſpect, albeit he imploy his *natural faculties* in this action: but *God* doth not work by ſuch waies upon the *will*, as not being capable of any ſuch addreſſes to be *immediately* made to it by *Argument*; as which is a *blind faculty*; But whenever

God

God works upon the will, he doth make ſuch an *impreſſion* upon it, as to take off that *ſtifneſs* wherein it ſtands off, notwithſtanding the *underſtanding bend and yield to Arguments* propoſed to it. And thus God acteth purely in a [Phyſical way,] as you ſpeak, albeit it be to bring the will to do that which is *moral*. It is not the *morality* of the *action whereto* God leads the *will*, that ſufficeth to ſtile the *action of God, whereby* he himſelf leads the *will moral*. There is required to this denomination of an action *moral*, a *moral* tendency in reſpect of the *way* or *means*, not only in reſpect of the *end* or *term*. But though you have not had the good luck to ſave your ſelf from ſtumbling; yet you are pleaſed to be ſo kind to your Reader, as ſeaſonably to warn him of [ſtumbling] and to this purpoſe ſadly ſignifie, that [it no waies follows from the Premiſſes, that a Miniſter by his Preaching and perſwading to duties, ſhould doe as God himſelf doth, in or towards a perſwading of men hereunto. It only follows, that the Miniſter doth cooperate with God, which the Apoſtle himſelf affirmeth, in order to one and the ſame effect, *i. e.* that he operates by one and the ſame kind of efficiency with God; *viz.* morally or perſwadingly, not neceſſitatingly.] To ſave your Reader from [ſtumbling,] you have taken the pains to lay a fair *block* in his way: For, if [the Miniſter and God work with one and the ſame kind of efficiency] then the *Miniſter*, for ought I can ſee, works as *much as God*. For 1. If they work [with one and the ſame *kind* of efficiency,] then for the ſpecies, *Gods* operation is no other then the *Miniſters*. And 2. If that God and the Miniſter may be ſaid to [cooperate,] one [muſt not *run*, and the other *walk* a ſoft pace,] as you phraſe it in your next words. Then *Gods* operation and the *Miniſters*, muſt not differ too much in *degree*, not ſo much as [running and walking;] though ſome may *walk* as faſt as others can *run*: ſo little difference do you acknowledg between the *Miniſters* operation and *Gods*, which it ſeems muſt keep the ſame *pace*, leſt they ſhould not be ſaid to [cooperate.] Nor do you ſalve the matter by that wherewith you cloſe this Metaphyſical parcel of your Learned Diſcourſe, that [when two perſwade to one and the ſame action, one may perſwade more effectually by many degrees then the other;] and ſo belike you hold, *God* doth, then the *Miniſter*, that [God may have a peculiar Act (I think it ſhould be Art) or Method of perſwading above him.] Very likely, but that muſt be by *infuſing* ſome new *light* of demonſtration, which ſurely the *will* is not capable of; and ſo God hath no [art or method of perſwading the will] *immediately*, more then the *Miniſter*. Yea more, God for the moſt part giving no *light* but by the *Miniſter*, and ordinarily not *ſpeaking* but by his *tongue*, nor *perſwading* but by *Arguments* in the Miniſters *mouth*, the Miniſter doth every whit as much as God, according to this Doctrine; the Miniſter perſwades, God doth not neceſſitate, no nor perſwade uſually but by the Miniſter. And thus you ſpeak ſomewhat *too honourably* of the Miniſters, to make them amends for the *diſhonourable* ſpeeches which ſome of your Diſciples are ſaid to have let fall of them.

You *heave* at another Objection, but which proves too *heavie* for you alſo. [If that act of God, by which he affecteth or moveth the wills of men, be in any conſideration *Phyſical*, muſt it not thus far, and in this reſpect have a Phyſical effect aſſigned to it? If ſo, what effect of this kind can we aſſigne unto it, unleſs it be the neceſſitating or determining of the will, to that action or courſe whereunto it is moved by it? You anſwer 1. That they who make the act of God meerly and ſolely Phyſical, do not ſuppoſe the effect which they aſcribe to it, *viz.* the neceſſitating of the will to that election whereunto it moveth, to be a Phyſical effect, but Moral; affirming I know not with what conſiſtency either with Reaſon or Truth, that the will, though neceſſitated by God, is yet free, in her election, of that, whereunto ſhe is ſo neceſſitated, whereby they conceive the morality of the action ſalved.] SECT. 7.

Here you are out again; as far as you would ſeem to be gotten into your Metaphyſical buſhments; and as *deeply* as you would be thought to diſcourſe, a *ſhallow* underſtanding may eaſily obſerve, that you dive not to the *bottom*, by many a *fathome*: For whereas the queſtion is, *How the action of God, in determining the will of man, can be ſaid to be Phyſical*, unleſs *it have a Phyſical effect?* (which can be nothing elſe but the determining of the will of man. (You anſwer, as it were from your adverſaries that

[The action of man ſo determined, is notwithſtanding but Moral, not Phyſical.] Now the *action of man* may be *moral*, and yet the *term of the action of God*, which is the *determining to that action*, be *Phyſical*, and ſurely your Adverſaries will not own it; that *the action whereto God determins the will, is not a phyſical action, but only moral*; nor that *the wills being determined of God to that action, is not a phyſical effect, nor thus the freedom of the will in that act whereto it is neceſſitated*, makes that *being determined not a phyſical effect*. They ſalve indeed the *freedom* of the act with the *neceſſity* of it, thus, that the will, though *neceſſitated* to that act, yet is not *compelled*, and ſo acts *freely* in oppoſition to *coaction*. 2. That the will, though *neceſſitated by God ab extra*, yet is *not neceſſitated* by any determination of ought in her *own nature ab intra*; and ſo acts *freely* in oppoſition to an *intrinſecal neceſſity*; not acting but according to the *dictate of the underſtanding*, according unto which God *moves her*; and which dictate of the underſtanding continuing, *ſhe ſometimes moves not, God not moving her*; whereas *brutes* are *always* led by their *fancies inanimate* agents, by ſuch an *inward principle* as *never forbears* to work *alike* in *like caſes*; and God *proportions* as it were his *concurrence hereunto*; but the *will of man* ſtill acts but according to the *dictate of the underſtanding*; and that dictate continuing the ſame, ſometime *ſhe acts not*, and God proportions his *concurrence to her nature*, and ſo acts *Cum neceſſario agentibus neceſſario, cum libere agentibus libere*, as they uſe to ſay. So that this is only to reconcile the *freedom of the act of the wills election*, with a *neceſſitie from Gods determining* (as in the caſe of *Cyrus* giving Commiſſion to build the Temple *neceſſarily*, yet *freely*; and *Joſiahs* burning the bones of the Prophets *neceſſarily*, yet *freely*; both acts were *neceſſary*, for they were *foretold*, and therefore *determined* long before, yea from eternity by God; and yet both were nothing the leſs *free*, as being both done upon *deliberation*, and one of them (at leaſt without any conſideration at all of a *decree of heaven*.) But this is not to ſalve the *morality of the act*, as you call it, on *mans part*, with the *phyſicalneſs* of the acting on *Gods*. We ſay plainly, every *phyſical act* muſt have a *phyſical effect*, for the act is phyſically nothing elſe but the *effect* produced by *it*, as it is in *fieri*, and comes from the agent; and ſo the phyſical act of God determing the will *actually*, muſt have an effect phyſical, the determining of the will *paſſively*. Well but

2. Say you, [The Phyſical or neceſſary effect, which anſwers that Phyſical act or efficiencie of God upon the will, now under conſideration, is that inclining or moving impreſſion towards ſuch or ſuch an election, which is acted upon the will, by this act of his, together with the perſwading force or weight of the Exhortations, wherein or wherewith he ſo inclineth it, or at leaſt attempteth to incline it. Thus far, or in this ſenſe, it is granted, that the act of God, whereby he inclines, or moves the wills of men, either to believe, or perſevere believing, is irreſiſtible, or infruſtrable, *i. e.* men cannot hinder or prevent thoſe moving impreſſions unto God, in one kind or other, which God is pleaſed at any time to impart to them, or to act upon their wills, though they may hinder or prevent the further and full prevailing of them to that deſirable end or iſſue which is intended by God. As the Jews of old could not hinder Gods riſing early, and ſending the Prophets to them to call them, but they did hinder the deſired event and ſucceſs of theſe applications of God unto them, *viz.* the actual reducement of them to repentance.]

Anſwer, 1. You grant as much as is deſired, that [men cannot hinder Gods impreſſions upon their wills;] *ergo*, ſay I, God makes impreſſions upon their wills *irreſiſtibly*, and therefore their wills are *irreſiſtibly impreſſed*; and theſe impreſſions being *irreſiſtibly made*, their wills are irreſiſtibly *moved*, and this is a *phyſical* effect. For that the wills ſhould have ſuch *impreſſions* to motion, and not be *moved*, is impoſſible; as that a *ſtone* ſhould have an impetus put *upon it* and not be *moved*; I confeſs ſomewhat without may cauſe the ſtone *not to be moved* whither that impetus would *carrie it*, but it cannot hinder the *motion ſimply*; ſo neither can any thing the *impreſſion to an election*, and conſequently the *election* wrought in the will by God. That of the [Jews hindring the deſired event of Gods application to them by his Prophets,] is altogether impertinent; there being in that, no *phyſical acting upon their wills*; if the *Prophets* could have hindred Gods *impulſes upon their ſpirits*, it had been conſiderable.

ble. That which you ſubjoyn of the [inexcuſableneſs of the Jews, and of men not acting according to the grace of God received, as the neceſſary effect of thoſe applications of God to the Jews, and his actions of grace on other men,] is all as impertinent as the reſt; this *inexcuſableneſs* being not a *natural* or *phyſical*, but meerly a *legal effect* (as I may term it) of theſe actions. And thus after all your winding and wrigling, the Objection ſticks in your ſides; and if the act of God be phyſical, ſo muſt the term of it be alſo.

Hæret lateri lethalis arundo.

Having diſputed ſo acutely againſt the working of *exhortations in general*; you now proceed ſecondly to trie your ſtrength againſt *Exhortations to Perſeverance* in particular.

[If God make uſe of Scripture Exhortations unto Perſeverance, to cauſe the Saints irreſiſtibly and neceſſitatingly to perſevere; then are all his promiſes made unto them, that they ſhall perſevere, or that he will infallibly work perſeverance in them in vain.] To prove this, inſtead of an Argument, you graciouſly give us a *Simile*. [If a Father ſhould firſt promiſe with the greateſt aſſurance he could make, that he would make his ſon his heir, and beſtow his inheritance upon him, and preſs his ſon to believe and expect as much from him, would it not be very incongruous, and indeed ridiculous, afterwards to exhort, admoniſh, intreat and beſeech this his ſon, that he would take heed that he loſe not this his Inheritance, aſſured unto him, *i. e.* made paſt loſing.]

I anſwer, 1. That you lay your buſineſs ſo, as that you prove that *Promiſes* make *Exhortations* in vain; not that *Exhortations* make *Promiſes* in vain, which was to be ſhewed: and ſo you take the ſtaff by the wrong end. Yet take it how you will, and prove that either Gods making uſe of *exhortations* render his *promiſes* vain, or his giving of *promiſes* render his *exhortations* uſeleſs; and carry the buſineſs.

Now, 2. why, I pray, may not a [Father promiſe his ſon an inheritance, and yet exhort him to carry himſelf ſo as not to loſe it?] The father may make over the inheritance to his ſon, and yet the ſon loſe it as ſoon as it comes into his hands; that is, run himſelf ſo far in debt, that he may be fain to *ſell* it as ſoon as he is *ſeized* of it. I ſee no inconſiſtencie between the fathers promiſe and aſſurance of the inheritance to his ſon, and his exhortations and admonitions in this caſe.

3. Yet I confeſs there is not in this the ſame caſe of *Gods promiſes* and the *fathers*; for that God hath the hearts of his children in his hand, and can prevent their miſcarriages, which the father in the caſe ſuppoſed hath not, and cannot do. But

4. When you tell us that [if the father only purpoſe, but not declare his purpoſe to his ſon to make him his heir, he may prudently enough adviſe him to carry himſelf ſo as that the inheritance may not be given away from him; but to admoniſh him ſo after a declaration that he is unchangeably reſolved to make him his heir, would be to ſend him into a far country, to fetch that, which he certainly knows before he goes is at home] You forget again, 1. That till there be ſuch a *Declaration of the purpoſe*, there is no *promiſe made* on the fathers part. 2. That God makes no *particular* declaration of his purpoſe to beſtow the inheritance of heaven to any of his children, but in caſe of *their perſevering in obedience*; and ſo his *exhortation* and *promiſe* are far from juſtling one againſt another, and he may without any [broad ſoleciſme in reaſon] exhort them all along to perſevere in obedience, that they may obtain the inheritance which he promiſeth to them only in caſe of perſevering in obedience. Yea but he [promiſeth to engage his Omnipotence to effect their perſeverance in obedience; and therefore ſtill, it is not a diſpenſation worthy of God, to exhort them to ſuch perſeverance.] What pitty it is you had not been by the Apoſtle to correct him, when he let thoſe incongruous words drop from his pen, *Work out your ſalvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you*, that is more then promiſeth *to work both to will and to do of his own good pleaſure*. And, *Having therefore theſe promiſes, to be Gods ſons and daughters*, (which ſure we are not but by his regenerating us) *let us cleanſe our ſelves from all filthineſs of the fleſh and ſpirit, perfecting holineſs in*

the fear of God. Sir, albeit God promiſe to engage his *Omnipotence* to make us perſevere, yet the perſevering is *our own* alſo, not only *Gods* act; and ſo nothing hinders but God may as well *exhort us to work* it, as *promiſe that he will work it.*

SECT. 8. And to my ſeeming, there is an indifferent good reſemblance of this in that paſſage *Acts* 27. where God promiſed *Paul*, and he aſſured all thoſe in the ſhip, that *not one of them ſhould periſh*, and yet told them withall, that *except theſe, viz. the Mariners abode in the ſhip, they could not be ſafe.* The conſiderations whereby you eſſay to ſhew this allegation, [irrelative to the buſineſs in hand] are not ſuch important ones, as to make me have much the leſs opinion of its full, at leaſt ſufficient correſpondence with it.

1. What if [this Promiſe were as all other promiſes of temporal good things conditional, and not abſolute?]

1. When we ſay that promiſes of *temporal* good things are *conditional*, our meaning is this, that we ſhall enjoy them upon *condition* they may make for our *eternal ſalvation*, not only that we ſhall enjoy them upon *condition* of our *endeavouring for them.* For many times God *caſts them* upon us when we *leaſt ſeek* them, and *withholds* them from us when we *moſt induſtriouſly labour* for them. 2. When we ſay that promiſes of *temporal* good things are *conditional*, in oppoſition to thoſe of *ſpiritual* things, the meaning is not as if promiſes of ſpiritual things were made to us *without our endeavours*, but that we are allowed to be *peremptory in preſſing God with thoſe promiſes*, as being of things the granting whereof tends directly to his own *glory*, and our *ſalvation*, as the preſerving of our *faith, charity, patience, thankfulneſs*, &c. but no promiſes of *temporal* things are ſuch as may be pleaded *upon ſuch terms* at the Throne of grace, but we are to ſue for them with a conſtant *reſervation*, if God in his wiſdom ſee them conducible to his glory, and our ſalvation, which it may be they may tend to obſtruct, and he purpoſeth to advance it more, by depriving us of all the temporal things we have, then conferring on us any we have not, or continuing thoſe we have. So that theſe *promiſes* of *temporal things*, are not *conditional* in reſpect of *means* and *endeavours* to be uſed *on our part*; in which reſpect *ſpiritual promiſes* are *conditional* alſo; but in regard of their *ſuſpending* on a *condition*, if *they make for Gods glory and our ſalvation.* And ſo this *conſideration* is as irrelative to this buſineſs, as you pretend the *paſſage* of the *Acts* is: For the promiſe of perſeverance and ſalvation to the Saints, is all as *conditional* in this *reſpect*, as was that to *Paul*, of the ſaving of the Company in the Ship; yea and of all *temporal promiſes*, this of the *ſaving of theſe perſons* was the *leaſt conditional*, as which God had *foretold* ſhould be *effected*; without *expreſſing* the condition of ſeveral endeavours on the part of thoſe perſons; albeit I grant they were *implied*, but not left at the *uncertainty of their reſolutions*, but decreed by God to be *infallibly performed* by them. So that I ſhall blot no more paper in ſcanning your deſcants upon this Promiſe, which I yield to be *conditional*, but with the proviſo above; and ſo is the *promiſe of ſalvation and perſeverance to that end, to the Saints*; and in that reſpect, Exhortations are of as much uſe *here*, as they were *there.*

I proceed to your tenth Section.

SECT. 10. [Other Scriptures there are, by which the Teachers of unconditioned Perſeverance, conceive they are able to prove, a rational conſiſtency between an abſolute Promiſe of Perſeverance, and an Exhortation hereunto.]

Sir, you are ſtill at your old fault, miſrepreſenting our Doctrine; we teach not Unconditioned Perſeverance as to *ſalvation*; we ſay perſeverance is the *condition* of *ſalvation*; nor unconditioned perſeverance as to the *favour of God without holyneſs.* We ſay, *that* is a *condition* without which no man can look upon him with *comfort*, or look for any comfort from him. Nor unconditioned perſeverance as to *holyneſs*, we ſay the *uſe of the means* is a *condition* neceſſarily required to it; when we ſpeak of abſolute perſeverance, we oppoſe abſolute perſeverance to perſeverance for a time, *not without condition.* Well but you go on, [Of this ſort are theſe Texts, *Wherefore let him that ſtandeth take heed leſt he fall. There hath no temptation taken you, but ſuch as is common to man; but God is faithfull, who will not ſuffer you to be tempted above that*

you

you are able, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape that ye may be able to bear it. So again, *Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his own good pleasure.* So the Apostle to the *Hebrews* having admonished them to take heed of falling away, yet professeth thus concerning them, *But beloved, we are perswaded better things of you, and such as accompany salvation, though we thus speak.*]

I answer 1. That though *these* Texts should fall short of evincing, the rational consistency between an absolute promise of Perseverance in our sense, and exhortations thereunto, yet may we sufficiently clear it upon other grounds. As that *Gods promise to keep us*, is an encouragement to us to *keep our selves from evil*, no allowance of us to *throw our selves into it*; and accordingly yields a *motive* wherewith to press an *exhortation to keep our selves*, is not an *argument* why we should *not keep our selves*, or why we should not be *exhorted* to keep our selves. Gods *promises* of a blessing, do commonly call upon us to *labour* for it in an holy way; and so lay no foundation whereon to build a careless *neglect* of due endeavours, nor are any way [inconsistent with exhortations to such endeavours.]

2. That the *first* Text, 1 *Cor.* 10. 12, 13. hath been examined already, Chap. Sect. and there found to containe a *promise of perseverance*; and yet withall it carries in it an *exhortation* to a Christian care of our selves, and heed that we Apostatize not. A *possibility of falling away*, we have all along acknowledged as in *our selves*, yea and somewhat, nay much more, *an impossibility of standing*, and therefore let [this caveat be given to true believers,] it makes so much the *more* for our purpose.

3. That the *second* Text affirms that *God worketh in us both to will and to do*, that is, not only to *will*, but to *perform*, not only to *enable to do*, or *assist in doing*, but to *do it in them absolutely*, and *compleatly*, and yet exhorts us to *work out our salvation*, and that *with fear and trembling*. So little inconsistency doth this Scripture suspect, between such an *assertion of Gods acting to a full and compleat height in us*; that is somewhat more then a promise, and *an exhortation* to us to do it, and that with an holy *trembling*. The Text speaks of *working out salvation*, that is, *persevering in working*, till we be fully *possest* of salvation.

4. For the last Text, I yield your Comment on it, and that it comes not up to the proof of that, for which it seems some have been too forward to alleadg it. If there were but *one* Text that carried such a consistency between *promises of perseverance*, and *exhortations* to it, *that* were enough, yea though there were *none* such, the Reason I have given were *enough*, especially all that you object against it being proved *null*.

You conclude, [There is the same reason of all those most serious and affectionate Desires, Obtestations, Wishes and Complaints, wherein God expresseth himself in the Scriptures unto his Saints, either as desirous of their perseverance, whiles yet they stand, or as agrieved in himself for their backslidings when they fall. That God should seriously exhort or intreat a man to do that which he hath promised unto him, that himself will infallibly work in him, or necessitate him to do, and withall hath commanded him to rest assured with the greatest confidence that may be, upon the truth of this promise; and much more that he should affectionately wish that this man would do that which he shall be necessitated, and that by God himself to do; are dispensations or deportments of so notorious an asystasie and incomportment, with an infinite wisdom, that consideration must needs cease from men, whiles they ascribe them unto God.]

If God have *ascribed* them unto *himself*, I should think it is an inconsiderate presumption in men to judg them to be of the least [asystasie or incomportment with the wisdom of God] how great and notorious a one soever his *own wisdom* dreams she discerns in them. Now I pray bethink your self coldly and calmly, whether God have not promised to *give new hearts and spirits* to his people; and yet whether he do not seriously *exhort and intreat them* to make them *such new hearts and new spirits*, *Ezek.* 18. 31. Tell me, doth not God [command them to rest assured with the greatest confidence upon the truth of this promise?] and yet doth he not *injoyn* them to do, what

what he *engageth* himself by his promise to do? When you say [that God should affectionately wish, *&c.*] you shew, I wis, what apprehensions you have of God. Shew me that word *wish* in all the Scriptures ever applied to God; you cannot hope to doe it; and can you presume to speak not only of Gods [wishing, but affectionately wishing?] shew me the word *affectionately* waiting upon any *Verb* to which God is the *Nominative Case*. Turn over the Scriptures, make use of Concordances, and whatever other aids in that kind, and find me out such a passage, and I will yield you the Cause. But do not Divines say things of this nature are ascribed unto God *per modum* effectus *non* affectus? and come you off with your itchy Rhetorick of God [wishing, and affectionately wishing] to overturn at once the *glory* of God, and the *comfort* of his children? Do you tell us [Consideration ceaseth from men while they affirm God exhorts us to do what he promiseth to do in us?] I pray where is your consideration in fastning upon God your *wishings* and *wouldings*, that are of so indigne an import of manifest imperfection? Sir, God stoops in these dispensations of seconding his *Promises* with *Exhortations*, and his *Exhortations* with *Intreaties*, to the weak capacities of poor men, which should make us magnifie his *grace*, not derogate from his *glory*; when he speaks as to us *poor men*, we are to think of him as the *great God*: Shall his condescension to *our infirmities*, harden us to a contestation against *his excellencies*? When he *promiseth* to make us persevere, he signifies *we cannot do it of our selves*, shall be *enabled to do it by him*. When he *commands* us to persevere, he signifies it is *our duty* to do it. When he *intreats* us to persevere, he signifies that we are guilty of *neglecting our duty*. Now why may not all these very well consist, that we are *unable*, yet are *obliged*, yet are *negligent* to do our duties, and yet still shall be *made able by God* to do them so as to find *acceptance* with him: No contrariety is there to be found in all these; and therefore no more in Gods declarations, exhortations, intreaties, promises. Go now and say that [his exhortations are dissensed] by his promises, that they are [infatuated and rendred unsavory, or at least useless and vaine,] and trie whether you cannot beat down all before you with such thunder thumping bravados. We have nothing to defend us, but the poor *foolishness of God*; and all we shall say for our selves is, that if the *exhortations* be thus abused by the *promises*, the Prophets and Apostles were guilty of handling them so unworthily long before *us*. It is a considerable plea that we do *peccare Authoribus istis*; and we humbly conceiv the exhortations will chuse rather to sit down under the wrong done them by these, then be righted upon any terms by Mr. *Goodwin*.

SECT. 12. You are now for the second branch of this Argument, to shew [That the Principles of our Doctrine, dissolve the efficiency of the threatnings, towards the end, for the accomplishing whereof they are given; and that they render them unsavory, useless, and vain. In order to the proof of this, you suppose [1. That the end intended by God in such threatnings, which threaten those that shall apostatize, with eternal death, is to prevent Apostasie in the Saints, and to work, or cause them to persevere. 2. That *this is one* of the Principles of our Doctrine, *God hath absolutely promised final perseverance unto the Saints*; and another this, *God will certainly, infrustrably, and infallibly work this perseverance in the Saints*. These two things only supposed, you say the evidence of this your charge breaks forth in full.] I yield both; but deny that either both, or any of them gives such evidence against us.

Let us hear you then, [For 1. If these threatnings be intended by God for the preventing of Apostasie in the Saints, the way, or manner whereby this end is intended by God, to be effected by them, must needs be by their ingenerating a fear or apprehension in the Saints of eternal death. 2. Such promises whereby they are made uncapable of any such fear, are absolutely destructive of that efficiency which is proper to those threatnings. And 3. Therefore such promisee wherein God should assure the Saints that they shall not apostatize, are apt to render them uncapable of all fear of eternal death, and consequently are obstructive and destructive of the operativeness and tendency of such threatnings.]

I grant, 1. [The end intended by these threatnings, is to ingenerate in the Saints a fear of eternal death, *viz.* in case they apostatize. And 2. That a promise which should

ſhould ſecure them againſt this fear of eternal death, in caſe they apoſtatize, is utterly deſtructive of the operativeneſs or tendencie of theſe threatnings.] But *ſuch a promiſe* is not pretended by any of us, and therefore three ſuch promiſes as we ſpeak of being only that God *will preſerve the Saints from apoſtatizing*, have nothing in them contrary to the tendencie of the former threatnings.

Did we ſay, as you are wont to ſlander us, *that the Saints ſhould be preſerved to ſalvation, albeit they deſperately ran on in all abominable practiſes*, and that they had *ſuch a promiſe* from God, *this* were indeed to overthrow [the tendencie and operativeneſs of the ſaid threatnings.] But we abhor this dream, and only ſay, *the Saints have a promiſe from God that they ſhall be either kept from ſuch abominable practiſes, or at leaſt brought by a ſtrong hand to repentance for them:* which hath a potent influence to the *keeping* them from ſuch practiſes, as being ſure to *coſt them ſo dear at leaſt*. Now ſaying but thus, we ſay nothing that is contrary to the tendencie of the threatnings. We ſpeak as lowdly as you, of the danger of eternal death lying on the Saints, in caſe they *apoſtatize*; yea, of the danger of apoſtatizing lying on the Saints, in caſe they were left to *themſelves*: And ſo adviſe them upon all occaſions, to *walk* with all poſſible *circumſpection*, and humbly to *pray* unto God for his *direction* in *every buſineſs*, for his interpoſing in their behalf againſt *every temptation*, for his ſanctifying *every thing* that betides them; as *bleſſings*, which elſe would unhappily occaſion them to *forget the good hand* that *gives them*; and *croſſes*, which elſe would put them upon *impatient repinings againſt God*, and unworthy *recourſes* to the *arm of fleſh*, and ſometimes *worſe* for relief from them. We do not flatter the Saints with the power of *Reaſon*, no nor yet with that of *Grace inherent in them*, as if *it* were *ſufficient* to enable them (however managed) to perſevere. We bid them *ſuſpect* themſelves moſt, when they are moſt *confident* of *themſelves*; and tell them, that even when they have as it were *one foot in heaven*, if left to *themſelves*, the *other* would ſlip, and *betray* them to *hell*. Only we aſſure them of Gods goodneſs to *keep* them, while they are ſenſible they are *too bad* to keep themſelves; and of his *power*, when they are apprehenſive of their own *weakneſs*; and of his *faithfulneſs* to them, when they are duly convinced of their *unfaithfulneſs* to him. And thus we ſay he hath promiſed to keep them from *apoſtatizing*, that he may keep them from *hell*. This Promiſe no where invades that threatning, that *in caſe they apoſtatize*, they ſhall *fall into hell*. A *hope* that God will preſerve them from the ſin of Apoſtaſie, doth no ways juſtle againſt a *fear* that if they be guilty of the *ſin*, they ſhall undergo the *puniſhment* of Apoſtaſie. [Whatever hardens men from the fear of evil, upon their non-perſevering, doth indeed ſuperſede all the vertue and vigor which is found in theſe threatnings:] but that which encourageth them only againſt the *fear* of not perſevering, *i.e.* that *they ſhall not perſevere*, hath no effect of any affinity to it. Alas Sir, the Saints are wont to be more afraid of *ſinning* then *ſuffering*. Our doctrine doth only provide for ſecuring them from this *fear*, when they are poſſeſt with the ſaid *apprehenſion* of their *corruptions*, which they grieve to find too *ſtrong*, and *diſtruſt* of their *graces*, which they are troubled no leſs to find too *weak*; when they *deſpair* of avoiding thoſe *ſins* which they *abhor*, and *doubt* of performing thoſe *duties* wherein they *delight*; when they find each *ſpark* of *luſt* burning as a *hell* in their *boſom*, and cannot *quench* it with all their *tears*, though their *eyes* become as *rivers*, and their *heads* as *fountains* of them; when they find every little motion of *anger* againſt *others*, inflaming them with the greateſt *indignation* againſt *themſelves*, and cannot be *reconciled* to *themſelves*, notwithſtanding all *ſatisfaction* given to their *brother*, who perhaps was *alone guilty* of *giving offence*; when they are *weary of themſelves*, becauſe they find themſelves *weary in holy performances*; when they are too much *caſt down* in their hearts, becauſe they doubt they are *not low enough*; and when they are *too low* in their thoughts of themſelves, becauſe they fear they are *too high*; when they *fear* that they do *not fear God*, and *believe* that they *ſin in believing him*; when they think they cannot *pray* becauſe they *groan*; and conclude God doth not *hear them*, becauſe he doth not *help them* againſt thoſe *temptations* with which they are more vexed for fear *they* ſhould be drawn to *diſhonour God*, then that *God* ſhould be led to *deſtroy them*.

In-

In ſuch caſes our Doctrine ſweetly ſecures them againſt the *fear* of thoſe ſins which they *hate*; and bids them remember Gods promiſe to *keep them from thoſe offences*, into which they tremble to think how their *corruptions threaten to drag them*. Our Doctrine then doth *not bid the Saints not fear hell, in caſe of non-perſevering in holineſs*; but when they *fear non-perſevering in holineſs* more then *hell*, it wiſheth them to reflect on their *intereſt in heaven*, and derive both *grace* and *comfort* from thoſe *precious promiſes*, whereby God hath engaged himſelf to ſtand between *them* and *themſelves*, and to preſerve them from that which they eſpecially abominate, *departing away from him*. And ſo whereas their *fear* of *falling* was apt to trip up their *heels*, this *hope* which is ſeaſonably and ſweetly miniſtred by our Doctrine *ſtrengthens* their *feeble knees*, and makes them *ſtand* in the confidence of Gods *ſtrength*, who were ready to *fall all along* in the conſcience of their own *weakneſs*.

SECT. 13. You make us ſpeak, as if we underſtood our buſineſs as well as yourſelf; and put a wiſe defence into our *mouths*, which was never like to come into our *thoughts*. [If it be ſaid (ſay you) that the intent of God, in the threatnings we ſpeak of, is not to draw the Saints by fear of puniſhment, or evil threatned, to do the things which accompany Perſeverance, but that they are drawn hereunto by a more heavenly principle, as *viz.* the pure, and meer love of God; You anſwer] What, I ſhall examine by and by: But in the mean time, you ſhould have done well to have ſaid, It may be we would ſay, *The intent of God in the threatning, is to draw us to do our duties out of pure love*. A man would think this ſhould be the ſcope of this wiſe ſaying, by the *grave anſwer* which you are pleaſed to return to it, by demanding, [What other intent can it be imagined that God ſhould have in the threatnings ſpecified, but only that aſſerted?] But not to wrong you, your *meaning* I ſuppoſe is better then your *expreſſion*, and it ſeems to be this: That we will perhaps ſay, that in theſe threatnings Gods intent is not to draw the Saints to do the things which accompany perſeverance, &c. but thoſe which are not Saints, *viz.* that theſe threatnings are intended for *others* only. But even this is ſo crude, that our ſtomacks will not digeſt it, as liberally as you are pleaſed to put it in our mouths. For ſurely we would not ſay, that God intends to draw thoſe who are *not Saints*, by whatever *means* to *Perſeverance*; ſince none but *Saints* are in a capacity of *being drawn to it*, by whatever *means*: Yet we may well enough ſay this, that God intends by thoſe threatnings to keep thoſe who are *not true Saints* from being *open Apoſtates*, and to perſevere *ſo far* as not downright to *renounce* the *profeſſion of faith*, though they never attained to the *truth of it*. I ſhall attend what you object againſt this. [Evident it is (ſay you) that theſe threatnings are not directed unto Hypocrites, or unſound believers; theſe are not threatned with the loſs of ſalvation, or with eternal death.] I had thought none had been threatned with it *ſo much* as *theſe*; and that this had been the *portion of Hypocrites* κατ' ἐξοχήν. Yea but ſay you, [They are in danger of loſing the one, and gaining the other, by perſevering in the way they are in unto the end, not by non-perſevering or departing from it.] True, not by *non-perſevering* in the *hypocriſie* of their *profeſſion*; they are by *non-perſevering* in their *profeſſion*. Beſides, ſay you, [Hypocrites and counterfeit believers, being at preſent in a ſtate of wrath, and in a way of periſhing, it is no ways agreeable with the wiſdom of God, that he ſhould threaten them with periſhing.] No: why doth he not threaten *Drunkards* and *Adulterers* with *periſhing*, who are yet fair enough on in that way? Yea but [with periſhing upon the account of ſuch a ſin, under the guilt whereof they were never like to come, as *viz.* that of Apoſtaſie.] But Apoſtaſie is a ſin, under the guilt whereof Hypocrites are of *all others moſt like to come*; and they who *profeſs the truth but feignedly*, are moſt like to fall to an *open abrenunciation*, and *violent oppoſition of the very profeſſion of the truth*.

Well, but you proceed. [And evident it is from *Heb.* 6.4,5,6, & 9. and ſo from *Heb.* 10.26,27,29. and other places, that ſuch threatnings as are now under conſideration, were directed unto ſuch as were at preſent true believers, and in a ſtate of life.]

I have ſhewed the contrary, *Chap.* *Sect.* Yet let it paſs, [that theſe threatnings are directed to true believers,] what then? Why then [they are directed

directed to them for their good, and to accommodate or bleſs them in one kind or other.] Be it ſo; [but this gracious import cannot ſtand in any other thing, but only in the powerfull aptneſs in theſe threatnings, to cauſe theſe perſons through fear of the ſore evil threatned, to bethink themſelves how, and by what means to eſcape it.] It is confeſſed; why but [then it clearly follows it, is no waies unworthy the greateſt Saints, or ſoundeſt believers under heaven, to act in order to their ſalvation out of a principle of fear, leſt by their neglience they ſhould deprive themſelves of ſo invaluable a treaſure.] Take all; and what will you be advantaged by it? yet ſtay too; [albeit the greateſt Saints and ſoundeſt believers under heaven, may have need of theſe terms of threatnings to keep them from neglecting of their dutie, it follows not that it doth [not *misbecome* to act upon theſe means] only, or [upon theſe conſiderations] only; yea or to have *uſe* of them. It is a diſparagement to the *glory of their Saintſhip*, that they have *need of ſuch means*, albeit it be their *happineſs* that they *make uſe of them*. It is a diſparagement to their *actings* that they are *helped in them* by *theſe means*, albeit it be their *happineſs* and *wiſdom* to *uſe theſe means*. A man is *wiſe* that *uſeth a ſtaff*, as being a *good help to him to walk by in the ſtreets*; but yet it is ſome *diſparagement* to the abilities of his *leggs*, that he hath *cauſe* to make uſe of ſuch a ſupporter. A houſe is *well preſerved* by a *buttreſs*, and it is a good *prop* to it, but withal it is *ſome diſparagement to the beauty of the building* to lean upon ſuch a *crutch*, though but for that that *holds it up*, it would *lie all along*. We yield it is the *wiſdom* of the beſt Saints under heaven to make uſe of any means to *ſupport their holineſs*, that it *ſink not*; but the *uſe of ſome means* betraies an *unworthineſs* in them, which when they come to *heaven* they ſhall be fully *delivered from*. [In ſuch a courſe and method of acting,] it is true [they conform themſelves to that gracious Councel, and adviſe which God out of his ſignal love and care over them, hath recommended unto them;] but God hath recommended this courſe and method of acting to them, meerly in *compliance* with that *frailty*, and *worſe*, which as *yet* is too *potent* in them, and which when they come to *heaven* they ſhall be happily *freed* from. It is not *overworthy of a child* to obey his parents out of *fear of a rod*, and yet it is the *love and goodneſs of the parents*, to have ſuch a ſowre monitor in the *window* or the *candleſtick*, to keep the child in *awe*; and albeit it be *well* that a *child is kept in ſuch awe by it*, yet the *elder* he growes, the more he begins *to ſlight that odd ſupervisors*, and yet the more he ſtands in *awe* of his *parents*. There are many things which do *well to keep Saints in obedience*, yet is it *unworthy* in the *Saints* to be *kept in obedience by them*; and even their *being held to obedience* upon *ſuch terms*, betraies *too great a ſpirit* of *diſobedience*. I think I ſhall not injure the Apoſtles in denying them *that honour* wherewith you are pleaſed to inveſt them, that [they were Saints of the higheſt elevation, when Chriſt addreſſed himſelf to them thus, *My friends be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom you ſhall fear; fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to caſt into hell, yea I ſay unto you, fear him.*] As *yet* the Diſciples had, it ſeems, too *great a fear* of no *great evil death*; which had they underſtood themſelves ſo well as afterwards they did, they would have looked upon as the *greateſt gain*, and been as *ambitious* to *die for Chriſt*, as yet they were *timorous*. I yield, it is [no waies unlawfull] I cannot that [it is not matter of diſparagement or diſhonour in the leaſt to the greateſt friends and lovers of God, and of Jeſus Chriſt, to act righteouſly out of a principle of fear of being caſt into hell by God for unrighteouſneſs.] It is a *low-ſpirited righteouſneſs* that proceeds on ſuch *mean principles*; yet ſuch I grant is the *righteouſneſs* in the *Saints* of the [*higheſt elevation*] *upon earth*, that they ſhall not do amiſs to reflect ſometimes on the pit of *hell*.

What if [Saints and true believers be not bound to wave or decline the influence or aſſiſtance of other principles which incline and lead them to the ſame actions and waies with the love of God,] *ergo* are theſe principles to be ſo much *prized*? yea theſe *other principles* which lead to the ſame actions, lead not to the *ſame actions in the ſame way*; nay more, they abate ſomewhat of the *intireneſs* and *luſtre* of thoſe *actions*. SECT. 14.

I cannot digeſt this, that [the fear of evil threatned, is as natural and genuine an effect of faith, as love itſelf.] If ſo, then is there [as natural and genuine an effect of faith] in the *Devils*, I ſay not as in your [Saints of the higheſt elevation] on earth, but even thoſe in the moſt eminent *manſions* of *heaven*. You will not preſently make it out, that theſe *love God*, more then the Devils *fear* him. I yield their fear puts them upon duty: but that duty which we perform out of *fear*, we perform but by *halves*, if *ſo much*: The *crown* of every *duty* is the *doing it out of love*. Let *Noah* be acknowledged [to be moved with fear to the building of an Ark] 1. I deny this fear to have been more then *Reverence*, εὐλάβειαν, that whereas *others* ſcoffed at the *mention* of a *flood*, and would have done it more at the *motion* of *building* an *Ark*, and did without all doubt at *Noah* all the while he was at his *work*; *laughed* to hear him *ſadly* ſpeak of harbouring all manner of beaſts together in thoſe ſtrait lodgings; and had as many *dry blows* at good *Noah*, as *Noah's* workmen gave *ſtrokes* in the building of the *Ark*. *Noah* held on his courſe, and out of an *holy reverence* to his *Maker* thought it *his wiſdom* to be the *Worlds fool*: He condemned the *Worlds mocking*, by this *reverence*. This was a *fear* of *ſuſpecting* Gods *wiſdom*, more then a *fear* of *incurring* his *diſpleaſure* to his own *deſtruction*. Yet 2. let it be *ſuch a fear* of being *deſtroyed by the flood*, this fear was rather the *foregoer*, then the *follower* of that *faith*, which put him on *building the Ark*. It was his *hope* of being *ſaved*, though by ſo *ſtrange a way*, that chiefly engaged him in this *work*. It was his *confidence*, that *weak veſſel* ſhould be uſed by the *power of God* as the inſtrument of his preſervation: And more, he looked through *this Ark* to the *Son of God*, and expected the deliverance of *his ſoul* by *him*, as well as of *his body* by the *Ark*. He ſubdued all the rebellious inſurrections of his Reaſon, and ſilenced all the refractory diſputes of his carnal wiſdom; and humbly adored the *wiſdom of God*, in that which ſeemed but *fooliſhneſs to man*. This *hope* was that whereby he chiefly *ſaved himſelf*, though even his *fear* added to the *condemnation of the world*; who *mocked* while he *mourned*, and *derided* that which he *dreaded*. But what if [*Noah* condemned the world, and ſaved himſelf and his houſe, by this act] this reacheth not to prove what you infer from it, that men may ſave themſelves and others as well by actions done out of a principle of fear, as of love. This of temporal deliverance comes not full home to *eternal* ſalvation: And ſuch is the other caſe of *Joſiahs*. Yet it is truer then you are aware, [that men may ſave themſelves as well by actions done out of a principle of *fear*, as of *love*.] I pray, by what *actions* do men ſave themſelves? It is their *faith* that ſhould have *this glory*: which chiefly carries it, by denying the ſufficiencie of *any actions*, whether *done out of a principle of fear*, or *love*, to *ſave them*. If [*Paul* tell *Timothy*, that *in doing this he ſhall both ſave himſelf and thoſe that hear him*,] he ſaith not he ſhall ſave as much as himſelf *BY doing it*. For quietneſs ſake I will grant you all, [That the Holieſt and beſt of men, and thoſe that have acted moſt at other times out of a principle of love, have yet been afraid of the diſpleaſure and judgments of God, yea, and ſuffered themſelves to be carried out by the hand of this impreſſion to ſuch actions and wayes for the preſervation of themſelves and others, wherein they have been accepted with God, and found peace and ſafety for both.] God is pleaſed thus to *reward* the meaneſt endeavours; will you therefore *magnifie* them? God hath *rewarded* even *Hypocritical ſervices*; will you *Saint men for doing them*?

It is true, [The preſent ſtate and frame of the hearts and ſouls of the Saints duly conſidered, which are made up of fleſh and corruption, as well as of ſpirit and grace, the former having need of bridles for reſtraint, as well as the latter ſpurs for quickening; Arguments and motives drawn from fear of puniſhment, are as neceſſary and proper for them in reſpect of the one, as incitements from love in reſpect of the other.] But though ſuch motives be [as needfull] it follows not that *to act upon them* is as *laudable*; or that it is not a *diſparagement and diſhonour* to their Saintſhip to have *need of ſuch motives*! and the *more need* they have of it, the more *diſhonour*; but ſurely the *leſs need* of them, the *more honour*. We deny not the *uſe of theſe motives*, more then we do the *remainders of fleſh* in the *beſt Saints*: but we deny the *efficacie* of theſe motives, to make men *act as Saints*. Well *theſe motives* may keep *Saints from acting*

as

as other men; they do not *act as Saints*, *quatenus they act upon these motives*; they *act not as Saints*, as long as they *act not out of love*; and when *they act out of love*, though the action may be less as to the *matter*, it is more accepted as to the *manner*. *Two mites* given out of *love*, weigh more *then two hundred talents* given out of *fear*.

And thus it argues servility in men, to be drawn by the iron cord of the fear of Hell, to do their duties; nor doth any other service or obedience become sons, but onely that which is free, and proceeds from love. Against this you reply, SECT. 15

[1. That if the great Lawgiver God, judged it not unworthy of him or his wisdom, to perswade, and press obedience to his Laws, upon true believers, by arguments drawn from fear of punishment, *Luke* 12. 4. they have no reason to judge it unworthy of them, to suffer themselves to be perswaded, and wrought upon accordingly.] It is true, [it is not unworthy of them, to suffer themselves to be wrought upon by fear,] yea it is most unworthy of them, *not to suffer themselves to be so wrought upon, but still* it is *unworthy of them* to *need* to be *so wrought* upon; nor doth the [*wisdom of God in using such arguments*] prove that it is not *foolishness in them* that *occasions* it; as it is *wisdom* in *parents* to *use the rod*, but it is the *folly* which is bound up in the hearts of the *children*, that *puts* them upon it.

[2. That there is a different consideration of the obedience of children to their natural parents, and of the obedience of the children of God to their heavenly Father, the first is taught by the inspiration of Nature, the latter by Precept, and the principle of it is planted in their hearts by the ingagement of Reason, Judgment, and Conscience, to consider those grounds, arguments and motives by which their heavenly Father judgeth it meet to work and fashion them unto such a frame; so that though the first be the more genuine and commendable, when it ariseth from the pure instinct of nature, without fear of punishment; yet the latter is then most commendable, when it is raised by a joynt influence of all those Arguments, Reasons, Motives, and Inducements whatsoever, by which their heavenly Father desires to plant and work it in them.]

I answer 1. That as the obedience of children to their natural parents, ariseth from [the inspiration of Nature,] as you word it, so doth that of *believers* to their *heavenly Father*, from the *inspiration of grace*, which is as a *new nature*, nor is it meerly [by the ingagement of Reason;] but by a *secret bent* of their souls, which *ingageth their reason above* its *natural abilities*, and oftentimes *against* the vogue of it.

And 2. That even the obedience of children to their natural parents is *raised* by [the ingagement of Reason;] and the more they come to make use of their Reason, the more ordinarily they *obey* their *parents*: but the *fear of death* from the hands of their *parents*, would *abate*, not *strengthen* their *love*, whatever it do their *obedience*; and look what wants of *love*, so much of *obedience*, yea the *fear* of the *rod* doth somewhat this way. So the [ingagements of Reason] raise the obedience of the Saints to their *heavenly Father*, but the *fear of hell*, would rather quell and abate *love*, and consequently that which is principally valued in their *obedience*; wel they may, and do love him the more for the *corrections* which he inflicteth on them, but that is out of an apprehension of his inflicting them out of *love*; but the *threatning* of *hell*, speaks no such *affection in him*, and consequently cannot *raise it in them*. They love him for his *corrections*, because they see they are *chastened by the Lord*, *that they may not be condemned with the world*; they cannot love him the more, for *threatning to condemn them with the world*, *obey* him upon this account they *may*, it follows not that they *love him*; and if they *obey him without love*, that obedience is but *mercenary* and *servile*.

And howbeit you will not allow it to be stiled so [unless it be *grievous*?] yet where-ever there is any obedience performed out of *fear*, it is *grievous* of course, so far, as that he doth it *unwillingly*, and looks upon his *doing* only as a *less evil* then his *suffering* would be. Well fear may make him *do it readily*, it follows not that he doth it *willingly*; and albeit the *doing* be with *alacrity*, *fear*, the spring of it is *grievous*; every touch of the *spur* is *grievous*, as pleasantly as the *horse* may *pace* under it. That [fear of being drowned which made *Noah*, as you say, to build his Ark] was far from being

a *comfort*. And I am confident *Paul* took as little *delight in his* [*fear of being a caſt-away*,] as you repreſent it. He was not much *tickled* with that made him *beat down his body* to decline it.

SECT. 16. That of *John* is beyond contradiction, that *fear hath torment*, and that which a man doth upon *torment*, he doth not with a conſiderable delight; the *hope* mixt with the *fear*, I grant, *is ſo pleaſant, that* all the *torment* of *fear* doth not *abrogate* it: the *Sugar* makes the *Muſtard* the *leſs bitter*, it makes it not *ſweet*. *Noahs*, *Pauls* hope, I yield [made them act willingly and delightfully;] their *fear* was no ingredient of the *willingneſs* and *delightfulneſs* of their actions. The *predominance* of *hope* above *fear*, *is it* whereto this is to be attributed; I yield [notwithſtanding their fear and trembling, the Saints work out their ſalvation with joy;] but I trow, their *fear* and *trembling* was a ſorrie addition to their *joy* in working: the *leſs fear*, the *more love*; the *more love*, the *more chearfulneſs* in every action.

Now then conclude upon the whole as much as you liſt, [That the threatnings of eternal death, in the Scriptures, which are bent againſt the face of backſliders, are a means graciouſly vouchſafed by God to his Saints, to ſave them from Apoſtaſie, and this by raiſing a fear of hell within them, in caſe they ſhall neglect his counſel for their perſeverance; and conſequenly that all thoſe threatnings are made powerleſs and uſeleſs, by that Doctrine which teacheth any abſolutneſs of promiſe made unto the Saints for their final perſeverance.] We deny this conſequence: God may *abſolutely promiſe* to make the Saints *perſevere to the end*, which we affirm; yet not *promiſe* to make them *perſevere abſolutely*, that is, without a *due care of themſelves*; whereto they are oft-times led by the *fear of hell*. His *promiſe* is *abſolute*, as to *his performance*, not as to *their perſeverance*: He *abſolutely promiſeth* to *work* them to perform the *condition* required to ſalvation, and he uſeth to make them often *mindfull of hell*, to *keep* them the better in the *way to heaven*. You do but brave it in ſaying [his threatnings are turned into rotten wood and ſtubble, by the Principles of our Doctrine.] Your *concluſions* from it, are but *ſmoke* and *vapour*.

SECT. 17. You are for the third branch of this your ſecond Argument; wherein you endeavour to ſhew that the Principles of our Doctrine [evacuate all the promiſes of God, which are given in order to the procurement of perſeverance of the Saints. The efficiency of them (ſay you) is meerly nullified, by ſuch a ſuppoſition as this, that *Believers ſtand bound to believe an abſolute impoſſibility of their final declining*.] How often have you been told, that we are ſo far from aſſerting it, that we maintain an *abſolute impoſſibility* of their perſevering as to *themſelves*? [For when men are ſecured, and this by the infallible ſecurity of faith, that the good things promiſed are already theirs, by the title of faith, and that they ſhall certainly perſevere in faith unto the end, what need or occaſion is there to perſwade or move theſe men to do that which becomes them in order to their perſeverance, by any argument drawn from the promiſe of ſuch things?] Yes Sir, though they have an *habitual* aſſurance, they have not alwaies an *actual* aſſurance that they *ſhall perſevere*; and every time they *neglect their duty*, they *loſe that aſſurance*; and are at length apt to ſuſpect they ſhall not have *ſtrength* to perform their *duty again*. To raiſe their hearts ſinking under ſuch thoughts that they ſhall want ſtrength, theſe promiſes are of a very ſoveraign uſe and vertue. [A promiſe made to a man, of having, and keeping that which is his own already, and which he certainly knows, ſhall not, cannot be taken away from him, can have no influence upon him by way of excitement, to labour for the obtaining of it, or to do the things by which it is to be obtained.] True; but the Saints *have not perſevered to the end, till they come to the end*; and therefore in the *mean time*, albeit they have *that*, which they certainly know *ſhall not*, *cannot be* taken from them, yet is there place for [excitement by promiſes to perſevere,] eſpecially conſidering that their *graces* are ſuch as ſhall not, cannot be taken from them, in reſpect of *Gods promiſe only*, not *their own power*. The promiſes of perſeverance are all *conditional*, as to the *means* to be uſed by the *Saints*; they are not *abſolute*, but in regard of the *irreverſibleneſs* of them on *Gods part*, who will perform the *conditions* in the *Saints*. [Whatſoever nullifieth the means, is indeed deſtructive unto the end.] But theſe promiſes

miſes are ſo far from [nullifying the means] that they promiſe nothing ſo much as the *uſe of the means*; whereunto men are encouraged by nothing ſo much as this, *that they ſhall not want ſtrength to do it*. And thus much for your ſecond Argument; which when it concludes no more but a *poſſibility of the Saints defection, and this unto death*, it concludes *leſs* then *we* are ready to *grant*, who yield an *impoſſibility of their non defection unto death, as in themſelves*, and only teach an *impoſſibility of their defection*, in regard of *God* and his gracious *engagements*, to interpoſe *his own power* for *preventing* it.

You would be thought to advance a third Argument, but indeed it is but your former new flouriſhed. SECT. 18.

It is this, [That Doctrine which repreſenteth God as weak, incongruous, and incoherent with himſelf, in his applications unto men, is not from God; and conſequently that which contradicteth it, muſt needs be the truth. But the Doctrine of Perſeverance, oppoſed by us, putteth this great diſhonour upon God. *Ergo*. To prove the Minor, you ſay the Doctrine of perſeverance bringeth God upon the great Theatre of the Scriptures, ſpeaking thus, or to this effect, in the audience of Heaven and Earth, unto his Saints; and then make a Speech, wherein you pretend his exhortations, threatnings, and promiſes, ſenſeleſly, and ridiculouſly croſs and thwart each other.] *Arg.* 13.

But firſt, This is no more then what you ſaid in *effect* in *your laſt Argument*; nor is any *new conſideration* in this, that [Our Doctrine makes God weak, incongruous, and incoherent in his exhortations, threatnings and promiſes,] more then in this, that according to our Doctrine, *his exhortations, threatnings, and promiſes, are not coherent*. So that this is but to bring us a ſecond diſh of the ſame Coleworts. Yet ſecondly, Let us examine this *ſpeech* which you pretend [God makes according to the Principles of our Doctrine;] wherein if you put *any thing* beſides that which *our Doctrine* aſſerts, you injure us; if *nothing* but what the *Scriptures* aſſert, then are *you* as truly guilty of diſhonouring God *in ſaying* [*He ſpeaks incongruouſly*] as you moſt falſly charge *us* with this *hainous crime*. The ſpeech then is this:

[You that truly believe in my Son Jeſus Chriſt, and have been once made partakers of my holy Spirit, according to my will and command given unto you in that behalf, yea according to that enſealing of truth within you, which you have from me, that you cannot poſſibly, no not by all the moſt horrid ſins, and abominable practiſes, which you ſhall, or can commit, fall away, either totally or finally from your faith; that in the midſt of your fouleſt actions and courſes, there remains a ſeed of grace or faith within you, which is ſufficient to make you true believers, and to preſerve you from falling away finally; that it is impoſſible you ſhould die in your ſins, you that know, and are aſſured, that I will by an irreſiſtible hand work perſeverance in you, and conſequently, that you are out of all danger of condemnation, and that heaven and ſalvation belong unto you, and are as good as yours already; ſo that nothing but giving of thanks appertains unto you, which alſo you know that I will (do you what you will in the mean time) neceſſitate you unto: You, I ſay, that are fully and throughly perſwaded, and poſſeſt with the truth of all theſe things, I earneſtly charge, admoniſh, exhort and beſeech you that you take heed to your ſelves, that ye continue in faith; that there be not at any time an evil heart of unbelief in you, to depart from the living God; that you fall not from your own ſtedfaſtneſs; yea I declare and profeſs unto you, that if you ſhall *draw back, my ſoul ſhall have no pleaſure in you*; that if you ſhall deny me, I will deny you; that if you be again overcome of the luſts of the world, and be intangled therewith, your latter end ſhall be worſe then your beginning; that if you ſhall turn away, all your former righteouſneſs ſhall not be remembred, but you ſhall die in your ſins, and ſuffer the vengeance of eternal fire. On the other hand, if you ſhall continue unto the end, my promiſe is, that you ſhall be ſaved. Therefore ſtrive to enter in at the ſtrait gate, quit your ſelves like men, labour for the meat that endureth unto everlaſting life, and be not ſlothfull, but followers of them, who through faith and patience inherit the promiſes.]

To rip up this rare and ridiculous Oration, which you are pleaſed to ſay [we make

make God to ſpeak, upon the great Theatre of the Scriptures;] I muſt tell you firſt, That many a precious ſoul which truly believes in Jeſus Chriſt, and hath been made a happy partaker of his holy ſpirit, in moſt eminent manner, and hath a choice impreſſion of the enſealing of truth upon her, is far from being *aſſured* that ſhe either *believes*, or hath any *portion of that holy ſpirit*, or any other but *black marks* upon her, and is apt, becauſe of the *riſing of her corruptions*, and *interpoſing of her infirmities*, to ſuſpect ſhe is not capable of avoiding a moſt *miſerable downfall* into the bottomleſs pit; to look upon every one of her *neglects* of *duties*, yea or *perfunctorie performances* of them, as *unpardonable provocations* of the Majeſty of heaven; to account every *light ſlip* a moſt *horrid offence*, and every *ordinary tranſgreſſion* a *moſt abominable wickedneſs*; to judge every *idle word* no leſs then an *hainous action*; and every *evil thought*, as much as a *lewd ſpeech*; and to expect the *heavier doom* from the *juſtice of God*, the *higher thoughts* ſhe hath, of that *infinite mercy of his*, which ſhe is conſcious to her ſelf ſhe hath unworthily *undervalued*: Yea to conclude ſhe never had any *ſeed of grace* as big as a *muſtard-ſeed*, but that all theſe practiſes for which ſhe received *applauſe* from *others*, and wherein ſhe took ſome *ſatisfaction* to *herſelf*, were only *fairer off-ſprings* of *a filthy root*, and the *leſs ſtinking vapours* of a *rotten heart*, that ſhe never had any degree or *ſcruple* of true faith, and is in that reſpect only *incapable of falling finally from it*; that ſhe never had any the *leaſt beginning* of it, that there is an *impoſſibility* ſhe ſhould not *die in her ſins*, wherein ſhe hath ſo long *lived*; and that neither the *mercy of God* can pardon her with honour, no nor his *juſtice* allow him to reprieve her much *longer*, having been worthy to be condemned by his righteous judgment *many years agoe*; ſo that hell, and all the plagues of it, are her juſt due, part whereof ſhe hath *already* here upon earth, and owes God more thanks then ſhe is able to return, that ſhe hath not yet ſuffered thoſe *torments in their*, and *her own place*; and ſhe is not to be convinced but that ſhe is as juſtly, as fully perſwaded, and poſſeſt with the undeniable truth of theſe ſad things. Every believer doth *not believe that he believes*; and even when *you* may be *able to prove it*, *he* is ſometimes *obſtinate* in denying it. So that here 1. you are guilty of miſrepreſenting our Doctrine, as if becauſe it ſpeaks of the *perſeverance* of believers, it talked as liberally of their *aſſurance*. How many are there whoſe ſalvation is ſaid by us to be ſure, in reſpect of Gods decree, *& certitudine objecti*; yet not to be ſo in reſpect of their own *perſwaſion*, *& certitudine ſubjecti*? Alas there is many a man whoſe *name* is in the *Book of Life*, yet *reads* nothing but the ſentence of *death* in his own *boſome*, and *writes bitter things againſt himſelf*, as *ſweet* and *comfortable* as he may read in the *Scriptures* of *God* 2. You are not innocent from the like miſcarriage, in giving out, [That we ſay, That believers cannot by all the moſt horrid ſins, and abominable practiſes, which they can commit, fall away, either totally or finally from faith.] Our Doctrine ſaith that *believers are kept by God from ſuch horrid ſins, and abominable practiſes*; not that thoſe *horrid ſins, and abominable practiſes would not keep them from God.* She ſaith that the *ſeed* of *grace* or *faith*, within believers, remains even in the midſt of their *fouleſt courſes*; ſhe ſaith not, that they are believers *actually*, amid ſuch courſes; yea did that *ſeed work out*, it would *prevent*, as when it *works*, it makes them *repent* ſuch courſes with ſorrow and ſhame; ſhe ſaith indeed, *believers ſhall not die in their ſins*; ſhe ſaith not, *it is impoſſible.* Alas Sir, ſhe is not to learn how many *caſualties* believers are ſubject to; ſhe only ſaith, thoſe *caſualties* are all overruled by the *providence* of God. When believers reflect on that *providence*, they remember they are too *great in heaven*, to ſtoop to ſuch deſpicable things, as are the beſt, wherewith the *world can* tempt them to ſin. When believers ſin, it is through *forgetfulneſs* of *God* and his gracious *providence*, the conſideration of his *purpoſe* by an irreſiſtible hand to *work perſeverance in them*, is that which makes them *reſiſt thoſe temptations* which would draw them to do that, by which they ſhould *diſhonour their gracious God*, and expoſe *themſelves to the trouble of* repenting; the *ſorrow* whereof is greater then the *pleaſure* of ſin can poſſibly be: What, ſhould they pleaſe themſelves to *drink* up that which they know God will make them to *vomit* up with an equal mixture of *pain* and *ſhame*? Though they be out of danger of being condemn'd to *hell*, through the *goodneſs of God*,

God, they are ſure to find a *hell within them*, in condemning themſelves for every *wickedneſs* they ſhall commit. And ſeeing *heaven* and *ſalvation* are ſurely theirs, what ſhould they ſo far value ought on *earth*, as to ſtoop to take it up in a way unworthy of them? *Heaven* being theirs, ſo is the *Earth* too; and when they *have nothing*, they *poſſeſs all things*.

3. And yet though the Saints thoughts are wont to work in this way, while they are clear and undiſturbed, yet through the continual bubling up of their corruptions, theſe thoughts are ever and anon apt to be troubled; and I know not how the fleſh too frequently gets up above the ſpirit, and ſo emaſculates it, that *the good which they would, that they do not, and the evil which they would not, that they do*. The *beſt* of *Saints* are no *better* then *men*, and the *beſt* of *men* have ſomwhat of the *beaſt* in them; *one* part that is *brutiſh*, and hath need of *yokes* and *bridles* to reſtrain it from breaking out into the vileſt enormities.

And therefore to proceed to the next part of the Harangue which you ſay [we make God deliver on the great Theater of the Scriptures:] No wonder though he earneſtly charge, admoniſh, exhort, and beſeech them to take heed to themſelves that they continue in the faith: Not only their *luſts* are apt to betray them from it, but their very *reaſon* too; their *fleſh and blood*, though it be not *called* to *counſel*, is ever and anon apt to *give* its wiſe *judgement* unasked, and is too forward to *ſpeak* its mind, even when they are moſt *backward* to hearken to it; to tell them long, and ſeemingly probable tales of *advantages* they may make by quitting their *faith*, which is not like to gratifie them for the trouble and coſt that it putteth them to as long as they live; and to whiſper as much of the more commodious ways of the *world*; that to depart ſometimes from the *living God*, is to *walk not unwiſely*; that to *fall* a little from their moroſe *ſteadfaſtneſs*, is the way to *riſe*. To check theſe ſawcy items given by the *fleſh*, the *Spirit of God* declares and profeſſeth, that *if they ſhall draw back, his ſoul ſhall have no pleaſure in them*. And wherein is all the *comfort* of *their ſouls*, but in the *pleaſure* of *his*? That *he* is pleaſed with their *weak endeavours* and *ſmall deſires*, as long as *ſincere*; that then they find *acceptance* with him, when they have little *approbation* from *themſelves*, and greateſt *diſcouragements* from others. All their hope lies in this, that he will not *deny* them, though all their neareſt relations *diſclaim* them; yea, that he doth not *deny their requeſts*, when he doth *not grant them*; but rather *grants* them when he *denies*, and vouchſafeth them that which is *better*, when he denies them that which is *worſe*. To be *denied* by him, ſo as not to be *owned* by him, is the greateſt unhappineſs that can befall them; and yet it is that which they moſt juſtly *deſerve* when they *deny him*, which they daily do in one reſpect or other, being unawares intangled by the ſlie *luſts* of the world, which ſteal upon them ſo as to endeavour to *overcome* them, and to make their *latter end worſe then their beginning*. So that they are in *danger* of turning away from their righteouſneſs, *dying in their ſins*, and *ſuffering* the *juſt vengeance of eternal fire*, and cannot *poſſibly* eſcape it, did not *God watch over them*, ſo as to make them *watch over themſelves*; keep a ſtrict *hand* over their *hearts*, which are of themſelves apt to be too *looſe*.

In theſe reſpects, notwithſtanding all the work of Gods Spirit upon them, and the beſt aſſurance they have that he will continue it, there is juſt ground for his earneſt charges, admonitions, exhortations to them, to look narrowly to *themſelves*; and it is his grace to *beſeech them*, that they would *beſeech him* to make them beware of *themſelves*, and that *corrupt part* in them, which is ready on all occaſions to betray them to *ruine*. They cannot continue without care; nor doth he work in them otherwiſe, then to make them *work out their ſalvation with* an holy *fear* and *trembling*; and having the ſweet encouragement of his *precious promiſes*, to *perfect holineſs in his fear*. The *gate* of heaven is *low*; and ere they enter, they muſt *ſtoop* and bring down all their *high thoughts*: To do this, they muſt ſtrive againſt a potent party *within themſelves*; and ſeeing *that* is ſo *diligent* on *its* part, it concerns them not to be *ſlothfull* on *theirs*. The *promiſes* will not be *inherited*, unleſs they ſtudiouſly follow the *faith* and *patience* of their *brethren*; and eſpecially *imitate him*, whoſe *meat and drink it was to do the will of his father*, and who *deſpiſed the ſhame, endured the croſs, and is now at the right hand of the Majeſty on high*.

Thus

Thus is there no ſuch [ridiculous incongruity] between the Principles of our Doctrine rightly ſet down, and theſe Exhortations, Promiſes, and Threatnings in the Book of God: nor doth it repreſent God irrational in his addreſſes to men; but you have inconſiderately impoſed many a miſhaken conceit upon us, and have only ſhewed the [ridiculous incongruity] of your own *Doctrine*, not of our *Doctrine*.

SECT. 19. *Arg.* 4. [If there be no poſſibility of the Sants falling away finally, then is their perſevering unto the end uncapable of reward from God. But their final perſeverance is not uncapable of reward from God. *Ergo.* The Minor you preſume upon: The Major you ſay ſtands as firm, upon this foundation; No act of the creature whereunto it is neceſſitated, or which it cannot poſſibly decline, or but do, is by any law of God, or rule of juſtice, rewardable.] What think you, I pray, of Chriſts obedience to the Law? was not he, as *man*, a *creature*? was not his obedience to the Law ſuch as it was not *poſſible for him to decline*? was it not *rewardable* by God? This *queſtion* might give a ſufficient *anſwer* to your argument; nor need we ſay more to ſhew that your [foundation] is not *rock*, but *ſand*. But go on.

[Therefore if the Saints be neceſſitated by God to perſevere finally, ſo that He leaves them no poſſibility of declining finally, their final Perſeverance is not according to any law of God, or man] (What makes that here? doth [mans law] take notice of final perſeverance of the Saints?) [nor any principle of ſound Reaſon or equity, any whit more capable of reward then actions meerly natural are: Nay, of the two, there ſeems to be more reaſon why acts meerly natural, as eating, drinking, breathing, ſleeping, &c. ſhould be rewarded; in as much as theſe flow, though in a way of neceſſity, yet from an inward principle, and connatural to the agent, then ſuch actions whereunto the agent is conſtrained, neceſſitated, or determined by a principle of power from without, and which is not intrinſecal unto it.]

A man might think it was no leſs Doctor then *Reverendo Padre Don Antonio de Sleepo Fetherbeddo Pillibero*, having firſt eaten as much as came to his ſhare, that breathed or ſnored this. Is [eating and drinking] come to be put in the ballance with [perſevering in faith, and obedience to Gods holy laws?] yea, and to be ſaid [to weigh it down in point of rewardableneſs, becauſe forſooth it proceeds from an inward principle.] I beſeech you, doth not *believing* come from [an inward principle?] *immediately*, though not *principally*, *with the heart man believeth*, (ſaith the Apoſtle) and doth not [*eating* and *drinking*] come from an *outward principle* in ſome ſenſe? Can you *eat*, more then *earn* your bread without God? doth not he move your *teeth* as well as your *tongue*? are not all your movings *in him*? Well, but [It is true, (ſay you) a Prince or great man may, if he pleaſe, beſtow gifts of what value he pleaſeth, upon thoſe who live, breath, and eat.] I wonder what gifts he can well beſtow upon any *others*. [But he cannot be ſaid to reward them for living, breathing, eating.] He may for *living in ſuch or ſuch a place*, where *life* is as bad as *death*; and for *breathing* ſo as to *blow the coals*, or elſe perhaps a *trumpet*; and for *eating* at ſuch a rate as the *maſculine Feeder of KENT*, or *drinking* like another *Tricongius*: And ſurely ſome great men have given conſiderable *rewards* to ſuch *worthy ſervices* as *theſe*, whoſe charity never extended it ſelf to *Perſeverance in faith and holineſs*. But the reaſon why he cannot reward eating, drinking, breathing, ſleeping, &c. is, [becauſe a reward imports a relation to ſuch actions or ſervices, which were in the power of him to have omitted or refrained, who performed them.] And ſo I think a man may refrain eating, drinking, ſleeping, at any time that he performs theſe actions: and that he is ſo far maſter of his *ſtomach*, that he may *dine* with Duke *Humphrey* whenſoever he pleaſeth; and of his *eyes*, that he may *watch* many an houre that he ſpends in ſleep. All this is ſuch ſtuff, that a man may doubt whether he were throughly awake that dictated it. But in ſhort, doth God *reward* any works of *ours*, but what are *of his own doing* in us? *Dona ſua coronat*, was the old word: It ſeems you will have the *glory of our works* to be purely *our own*, elſe *God* cannot have the *honour* of giving a *reward* to them. But this, though you ſlubber it over in haſte, deſerves I ſhould pauſe a little longer upon it; and accordingly I will here be content

tent to make a Digreſſion concerning the *Rewardableneſs of Works*: having firſt told you, that all which you add concerning [The promiſing of Rewards in order to the moving or inclining of the wills of men to ſuch or ſuch actions, that they are appropriate unto ſuch actions, unto the election and choice whereof men are not neceſſitated in one kind or other by any foreign power,] hath been ſufficiently anſwered above, where I ſhewed the conſiſtencie of Exhortations and Promiſes with ſuch a work of the *Spirit of God upon our hearts*, Sect. 3, 4, 5, &c. of this preſent Chapter.

A Digreſſion concerning the Rewardableneſs of mens Works.

1. THat no work of man can at all *merit eternal glory* in *heaven* as a *Reward*, hath been ſo abundantly cleared by ſundry of our Reformed Doctors, that I look upon it as not worthy any more of our pains.

2. That no work of man can *merit any temporal reward* here on *earth* from God, I humbly conceive hath been ſufficiently proved by my *ſelf* in another place; where I endeavoured to demonſtrate by way of Digreſſion, That *there can be no covenant of juſtice wherein God may be bound to man to* reward *his greateſt ſervices with the ſmalleſt bleſſings*.

3. And further I am apt to think, that the notion of *reward* carries in it ſomwhat, which as it ſuppoſeth a *work*, ſo it excludes *deſert* in that *work*, at leaſt ſuch as bears proportion to the *reward*; which is a *reward* only ſo far forth as it exceeds the *merit* of the work, but for the *remainder* it is a *debt*; a *debt* which poſſibly may not be recoverable in any *Court on earth*, but which we ſhould not need to *ſue for* at the throne of *Heaven*, all *Debentures* there being without all queſtion ſooner *cleared* then *ſtated*.

But, 4. *Whether God have promiſed to give heavenly glory in a way of Reward of our works, and will accordingly ſo give it*, is the point to be debated.

For the better ſtating whereof,

1. I ſhall make this *Conceſſion*, 1. That the Scriptures, ever and anon, ſpeak of *rewards* which God will *give* his people, both in *earth* and *heaven*. 2. That they ſpeak of Gods purpoſe to *give all men according to their works*; and ſo *heaven* ſhall be given *ſome* men *according to their works*, and *hell* ſhall be the portion of *many* men *according to their works*.

2. But I ſhall put in this *Caution*:

1. That the Scriptures ſpeak not of *heaven* to be given to *all* thus *according to their works*: How elſe ſhould *any Infants* come *thither* before they are in a capacity of exerciſing their *Reaſon*, and conſequently *Faith* which is ſeated in the intellectual part, without which it is impoſſible to do works pleaſing to God? 2. That they ſpeak not of *hell* as the portion of *all according to their works*; elſe ſhould *no Infants* be there upon the ſame ground, that none ſhould be in *heaven*: whereas the *generality of Divines* ſay, that *many Infants* are in *hell* for *original ſin*, though not capable of committing *actual ſin*; and the *Popiſh Doctors* ſay, *all Infants* which dyed *unbaptized* are *there*, not one excepted. 3. That the Scriptures ſpeak of many things to the *capacity of men of the moſt vulgar parts*, and oftentimes aim more at the *inciting* of men to *practiſe* their *known duties*, then at the *inſtructing* of them in the *knowledge* of *obſcure myſteries*, whereof they may be *ignorant*, yet little the leſs *holy* or *happy*.

Now I take the point in hand to be much of *this nature*; yet ſuch, that though we may be *ignorant* of the truth of it without much *danger* to our *ſelves*, yet the *knowledge* of it will make not a little for the *glory of God*; and accordingly the Scriptures,

though they say not much of it, yet have said enough in a little; or Inform such as shall be inquisitive into it.

And 1. They tell us concerning *our selves*,

1. That *all our sufficiency is of God.*
2. That *he worketh all our works in us.*
3. That *he worketh in us both to will and to do, of his own good pleasure.*
4. That *all our righteousness*, after all Gods working in us here on earth, are by reason of the unhappy mixtures of our own *corruptions* and *infirmities*, as *menstruous rags.*

2. They tell us concerning *Christ*,

1. That he hath *purchased heaven for all believers.*
2. That *all believers owe their faith to his purchase*, both as to the *beginning*, and to the *continuation* of it, with all the *fruits* of it.

This premised out of the Scriptures, I think fit to adde these considerations in a way of Reason.

1. Of the nature of Reward, as it relates,
   1. To the *person to whom* it is promised,
   2. To the *person who* promiseth it,
   3. To the *work for which* it is promised.

And

1. As it relates to the *person to whom* it is promised, it is,

1. An *encouragement* to him, to do the *work*, upon which he is promised that he shall *receive* the reward.

And in *this* sense, I grant *heavenly glory* is promised to us as a *reward* of *services* on *earth*, and hath such an *influence* on us, as *rewards* have on those *to whom* they are promised. Our *spirits* are quickend by this expectation of *heavenly glory*, to *set upon*, and *goe through* those difficulties which would soon *dismay* us, were we not *cheared* up with hope of such a *retribution* for our *labours* and *sufferings*. The *Crown* is that which makes the *Commandments* not grievous. This makes us *despise the shame*, which many times we *undergo* among *men* for *seeking* the *honour of God.* This makes us *neglect* the *honour* which many times we might *find* among *men*, if we would *comply* with them in *unworthy* waies. This makes us *undervalue* the *pleasures* and *profits* of *sin*, and look on the *reproach of Christ* as the higher *preferment.*

2. *Satisfaction* to him *after* he hath done the work, that he needs not *repent* of his *pains*, having a *recompence* above the *value* of them. And *thus* too, I grant *heavenly glory* may justly merit the title of a *Reward*; and it will make so *glorious amends*, that we shall take *pleasure above*, in reflecting on all our *troubles* here *below*, and account our selves *happy* in those *miseries*; yea *before* we come to be *seized* of *heaven*, the *expectation* of it may make us *triumph* in *tribulation* for *Christ*, and take an unspeakable measure of *inward joy*, in a seemingly insufferable proportion of *outward distresses.*

2. As *Reward* relates to the *work upon which* it is *promised*,

1. It is a *means* for the better carrying it on; and so is *heavenly glory*, as to the *work of holyness*; which considering how *cumbersom* it is to all men, both in *itself*, and *many issues* and *attendants* of it here on *earth*, would either be not *undertaken* at all, or at least quickly be *laid aside*, were it not supported by the *precious promises* of *heavenly glory.* *Morality*, it is true, is a duty which men owe to *themselves*, (in respect of their *interest* on *earth*) and that in *every branch* of it. As 1. For *sobriety* and *chastity*, they cannot *neglect either of them*, but they degenerate into *brutish*, and prejudice *themselves* alwaies in their *intellectuals*, sometimes in their *bodies*, oftner in their *estates* and *names.* 2. As for *Righteousness*, they cannot *transgress the rules of it*, but that they administer occasions to *others* to do the like, and mete them back their *own measure.* And howbeit possibly they may *receive no wrong*, though they *do no right*, yet they have *cause* to *expect* to be *repaid* in their *own coyn*; and cannot but be jealous of *all* they deal with, lest they will proceed by *their own pattern*, and practise the *lesson* which they *taught them against themselves.*

3. Yea, as for *Charity*, it is a duty which every man owes to *himself*, in *another*; a

nots

not knowing how ſoon he may ſtand in need of *anothers help* and *mercy*, as much as *any* poor brother doth of *his*. Who knows but he may be caſt among *ſtrangers*, and how can *he*, if he be a *ſtranger*, and in *neceſſity*, *expect* more reſpect to *himſelf*, then he *ſhews* to *others*, in the *like ſtreights*? Thus *morality* hath that in it, which may prevail with men to ſuppreſs their unruly affections, in order to their better *accommodations in the world*, and ſo doth not much need the egging on by *reward*, *Ipſa ſibi virtus pretium*. But *Holines* is of quite another ſtrain, ever and anon taking men off from all *outward advantages*, and leaving them nothing but *inward comforts* in lieu of them; which *inward comforts* are alwaies founded in ſo ſweet an *expectation* of *eternal happineſs in heaven*, as will overballance all *annoyances on earth*, which are commonly but *ſhort*, alwaies but *temporal*. And thus alſo may *heavenly glory*, very well come under the notion of *Reward*, as that which hath ſo great an influence on the *work of holyneſs*.

2. But then it would be conſidered 1. That the *Reward* in the common acception, is ever *different* from the *Work* upon which it is promiſed. 2. At leaſt, that *more* of the *work* is never promiſed for a *reward*, but in order to ſome *other* thing beſides the *work* to be obtained by it. As for inſtance, men do not uſe to promiſe *running* as a *reward of running*, or *wraſtling* as a *reward of wraſtling*. This were as we ſay, to promiſe *labour* for *pains*. The *reward* is alwaies ſomewhat of a *different nature* from the *ſervice*, and now and then *contrary*; as when *reſt* is promiſed as a reward of *hard labour*; and *diſmiſſion from the work*, as a *reward of diligence in it*. And even when *more imployment* is promiſed as a *reward* of *care* and *faithfulneſs in the imployment*; it is as I may ſay, the *Perquiſites* of the *imployment*, which are looked on as the *Reward*, not the *Imployment* it ſelf.

But as to this caſe of *Heavenly Glory*, it is nothing elſe but the *ſame thing*, in a *higher degree*, with the *work of holyneſs on earth*. Nor is there any *happineſs* that the Saints enjoy in *heaven*, diſtinct from the *works of holyneſs*, *viz.* an imployment of all their *faculties* in *ſeeing* and *bleſſing God*, and *renouncing themſelves*.

If it be ſaid, *There is a freedom from thoſe troubles, wherewith they were ever and anon moleſted on earth*; I anſwer,

1. That is but the *negative*, not the *poſitive* part of their *happineſs*.

2. That the *more* they *do* the *work* of *holyneſs on earth*, 1. The *more* they are commonly encompaſſed with *outward troubles*; yet the *joy* in the *holy Ghoſt* makes them *happy* amid all ſuch *troubles*, which is not only making them expect *freedom from thoſe troubles*, but *for their felicity*. And 2. The *leſs* they are peſtered with troubles from *within*, by the *breaking out of their corruptions*, which is nothing elſe but the being *made more holy*; nor is this *diſtinct* from *holyneſs*: In ſhort, *glory* being nothing elſe but a greater meaſure of *grace*, and the *happineſs of heaven* nothing but a *higher* and more *ſublimate* degree of *holyneſs*. This cannot be in propriety of ſpeech, a *reward* of *that*.

If it be ſaid again, there is *praiſe* for the *works of holyneſs*, which is a *reward diſtinct from* the *works*.

I anſwer 1. That *praiſe* is in him that *praiſeth*, *honor in honorante*, as was wont to be ſaid out of *Ariſtotle*, and ſo cannot make the *praiſed happy* of *it ſelf* and *immediately*, *but as ſome content* or *delight*, is occaſioned by it. Now if there were any ſuch *delight* occaſioned in the Saints, by whatever *praiſe* given to *themſelves*, they delight not *wholly* in *God* (as we know they do) but in *that* in *themſelves*, which occaſioned *praiſe* from *others*, and in the *praiſe* given them *by others* for *thoſe actions*, but *all* the *praiſe* hereof they return unto *God*. Shortly. Howbeit there be *ſome glory* which follow the *holyneſs of the Saints*; yet is not that *glory* any part of their *happineſs*; but this conſiſts wholly in *ſeeing the glory of God*, and *aſcribing it to him*: Nor indeed doth any Saint in heaven give *glory* to *another*, ſo much as *glory to God for him*, as looking on *all his works*, as wrought *by God*, who ſhall then appear more fully *to be*, to *have done all in all*. In the mean time it helps us to a further conſideration upon the

3. Particular of the nature of *Reward*, as it relates to *the Perſon that promiſeth it*.

Now the *Perſon promiſing a reward for a work*, doth it ordinarily,

1. Becauſe of ſome *benefit*, one way or other, accruing to *him* by the *work*.

2. And becauſe he cannot ſo well *procure* the *perſon*, *to whom* he promiſeth the *reward*, to do the *work*, without ſuch a *reward*. Whereupon it follows,

3. That he hath an eye to the *work* as his *end*, and uſeth the *promiſe of the reward* as his *means*. But in all theſe, the caſe between *Rewards* promiſed by *men*, and *Heaven* promiſed by *God*, is apparently different.

For, 1. There is no *benefit* in any kind, accrues to *God* by the *holineſs of men*. *My goodneſs extends not to thee*, ſaith *David*. *What is it to God, that thou art righteous?* ſaith *Elihu*. True it is, God is ſaid to *delight in the ſervices of his Saints*: but it is ſpoken *κατ' ἀνθρωπον*, He doth *as men that delight in ſervices done them*, viz. in regard of *new favours he beſtows upon them*, not of any *new pleaſure* he *receives from them*, as men do from thoſe *ſervices*, or at leaſt the *iſſues* of thoſe ſervices whereunto they *promiſe Rewards*.

2. There is no work done by men, upon conſideration of *heaven*; but that God *who works it all himſelf* in them, by the conſideration of *heaven*, could work it all, if he pleaſed, *without it*, and frame the *hearts* of men to ſet on it as *effectually*, though they had no *heaven* in their *eye*. So that he makes not *his* promiſe, as *men* do, for want of *power* to bring the perſons *to do the work*, at leaſt to *do it effectually*, *without ſuch a promiſe*; but meerly for his *pleaſure*. Which

3. Shews a vaſt difference between *Heaven*, and *Reward*, according to the common uſance of the word; that *God* aims at the giving of *heaven* as his *end*, and *helps* men to do the *works of holineſs*, yea *works all their works in them*, in order to *heaven* deſigned to them. *Men* contrariwiſe aim at the *work* as the *end*, and uſe their *Reward* as a *means*; and though it be given *after* the *work*, and ſo is *laſt in execution*, yet is it *aſſured before* the *work*; and when the work is *done*, it becomes a *debt*.

Thus then *heavenly glory*, albeit in *ſome* reſpects it may be ſtiled *reward*, yet in *others* it is moſt properly a *gift*; and a *free one* as to *us*, though a *purchaſe* as to *Chriſt*.

SECT. 20. *Arg.* 5. [They who are in a capacity or poſſibility of perpetrating the ſins of the fleſh, are in a poſſibility of periſhing, and conſequently in a poſſibility of falling away, and that finally, from the grace and favour of God, in caſe they be in an eſtate of grace and favour at the preſent. But the Saints, or true believers, are in a capacity or poſſibility of perpetrating the works of the fleſh. *Ergo.*]

It might ſuffice to tell you, your *Major* is not ſtanch, unleſs it run thus: They who are in a capacity of perpetrating the ſins of the fleſh, without repentance, are in a poſſibility of periſhing. But then the *Minor* will not hold water; for ſay *we*, the Saints, conſidering the gracious *decree of God* concerning them, are not in a poſſibility of committing theſe ſins without repentance. So that all that you ſo prolixly diſpute in this and your next Section, is beſides the point, and needs no further anſwer. That which *we* inſiſt upon is, that God hath purpoſed to bring them to repentance; elſe we yield, *all the Saints are in a poſſibility*, yea under a neceſſity of periſhing as to themſelves: God be praiſed, they are happily freed by his goodneſs.

SECT. 22. Nor hath [*this Doctrine been guilty of caſting a ſnare upon the world.*] They who *know* what it is to *repent*, will of all other men be moſt *afraid* to *offend*. What is a *moments pleaſure*, bought at ſo dear a rate as *many a dayes ſorrow?* What is the *gratifying* of the *fleſh* for a *ſhort ſeaſon*, to the *grieving* of the *Spirit*, it cannot be calculated *how long*? The thought of *Repentance* is enough to ſcare men from *tranſgreſſing*: What is a *Delilah* in a mans boſom, in compariſon of thoſe *furies* that are ſure to ſucceed? What is the *honey of ſin* in the *mouth*, in compariſon of the *gall* of it in the *bowels*? What is the *flattery* of others *tongues*, in compariſon of the *reproaching* of our own *hearts*? Who in all the world have been more eminently exemplary for their holy *circumſpection* then they, who you pretend have by their ill-laid Doctrine [caſt ſo dangerous a *ſnare* on it?] How can you make it good, that [many whoſe feet God had guided into the wayes of peace, were cauſed by this doctrine to adventure

venture ſo far in deſperateneſs of ſinning, that through the juſt judgment of God, their hearts never ſerved them to return?] Did any of them profeſs they *ſinned*, upon aſſurance they could *repent* at their own pleaſure, or ſhould be irreſiſtibly *brought to Repentance* by Gods grace in due time? If ſome of your *Saint-Ranters* have ſaid any ſuch thing, *we* ſay they miſtake *our Doctrine*, juſt as you have done all along this doubty Diſcourſe. We ſay, *No Saint can repent when he will*: It is God alone who gives repentance to life. True, when a Saint will repent, he doth repent; but it is above him to will to repent, and even that will is Gods own work. He who ſaith in oppoſition to this, he *can*, ſhews himſelf to have drunk in principles of a contrary complexion to thoſe of *ours*. We ſay, that he who *thinks he may allow himſelf to ſin, upon expectation that God ſhould irreſiſtibly bring him to repentance*, is already out of the way of God, and knows not what our Doctrine avoucheth. She ſpeaks to *comfort* the Saints when they are ready to *deſpair of Gods favour*; ſhe doth not *harden* any to *preſume on it*. But what if ſome *turn the truth of God into a lye*, and wreſt *our Doctrine*, as they do many other *holy truths* delivered in Scripture, to *their own deſtruction*; in this, *our Doctrine* is as *innocent*, as *they* are *guilty*. I pray remember what you ſaid once of your own Doctrine,

Nil prodeſt, quod non ladere poſſet idem.

That a Doctrine is of ſuch a *genius*, as to be ſerviceable to the Saints, for a happy increaſe of their *conſcientiouſneſs* and comfort, is its glory; that *wicked* men make themſelves *worſe* by what makes *good* men *better*, is their own ſhame. For a concluſion, you know who was ſaid to be a *gin and a ſnare to the houſe of Judah*: See whether *he* deſerve any blame upon that account. *All things* prove *ſnares* to ſuch as take a felicity in *deceiving themſelves*; and even thoſe which would *deliver* their ſouls, become means to *entangle* them.

[Others (ſay you) plead, that there is no reaſon to conceive that true believers, SECT. 23.
though they perpetrate the works of the fleſh, ſhould be excluded from the kingdom of God, upon this account; becauſe what they ſin in this kind, they ſin out of infirmity, and not out of malice.]

No, Sir, none of our Divines have ſo *mean thoughts* of the *merit* of the *leaſt ſin*, as not to acknowledge God may [upon that account exclude us all for ever from *his kingdom*.] Their *foreheads* are not *ſtrong* enough to plead their *infirmities* in bar of their [excluſion from heaven.] That which they ſay, is this; *God hath promiſed to heal their infirmities*, and *to paſs by the tranſgreſſions of his people*, to *conſider whereof they are made*, and *not to reward them according to their deſerts*. Their *infirmities* deſerve enough of *wrath* and *judgment*; only Chriſt hath merited the *pardon* of the *greateſt ſins* of their *unregeneracie*, and therefore much more of the ſins which *againſt the bent and ſtanding reſolution of their hearts* they commit *after their Regeneration*. He who hath ſatisfied for their *Preſumptions before* their *Calling*, hath not left them to pay for their *Infirmities after* it. Yea, he hath *purchaſed* for them ſuch a proportion of *grace*, as ſhall keep them for ever from perpetrating the works of the fleſh, that is, to the *height*, and as they *formerly did*: And he who purchaſed ſo much *mercy*, that ſins of a *deeper dye* ſhould not keep them from *grace*, hath purchaſed no leſs then that ſins of a *lighter colour* ſhould not keep them from *glory*. They ſay that ſins of infirmity ſhall not exclude them from the kingdom of God; not for that the *ſins* are too *weak* to *keep them out*, but becauſe their *Saviour* imploys all his *power* in heaven to *bring them in*. It is an argument they are *admitted into the Kingdom of Grace*, that they *ſin but out of infirmity*: That they *ſin out of infirmity*, renders them *not excluded from the Kingdom of Glory*. Such ſins, it is true, *forfeit* all their intereſt there at *Common-Law*; in the *Chancery* of the *Goſpel* they find *relief*. It concerns *Heaven* it ſelf, that Believers be not excluded for *ſins of infirmity*: All the *manſions in heaven* would lie *void*, ſhould no man be allowed to *inhabit* them, but ſuch as are *free* from thoſe *ſins of infirmity*. There were no place in *heaven*, for any ſoul that dwels in *fleſh*. The *Angels* might make the beſt of their *Palace*; no *man* could ever be in a capacity

to

to keep them company. Well, having *misrepresented* our Plea, you set your self to *oppose* it; yet so that

1. You make a gracious Concession, [That there are several kinds of sin in the general, which also make so many degrees in sinning in point of demerit; There are sins of ignorance, and sins of infirmity; and sins of malice; and sins of this last kind, you acknowledg to be far greater in demerit then either of the former.] True; but we give you no thanks at all for this your *Concession*. We are content to *own demerit enough* in our *sins of infirmitie*, to *keep us from heaven* with *pœna damni*, and *cast us* to *hell* with *pœna sensus*. We stand not upon this punctilio, of *less demerit* in our sins of *infirmity*; we insist upon this Grand Point, *That God hath promised not to charge these sins of infirmitie upon believers, so as to exclude them from heaven*, for *these* sins, whose *demerit* in the mean time we acknowledg to be *great* enough to intitle them to *hell*. We care not to say *these sins doe less deserve this exclusion*; we plead that *God* is *more mercifull* then to *proceed* to this exclusion. And to bear up our hearts in this truth, we have his Promise, his Oath, his Sons intercession, all lending us their assistance; and being thus backed, as we slight your *Concession*, so we shall not fear,

2. Your *Exception*, as boldly as it tels us,

[1. That to say that true Believers, or any other men, doe, or perpetrate the works of the flesh out of infirmity, in strictness of interpretation, involves a contradiction. For to do the works of the flesh, implies the dominion or predominancy of the flesh in the doers of them, which in sins of infirmity hath no place]

A contradiction must be *ad idem*. If by [*doing the works of the flesh,*] you mean *doing* them as *making it our business*, *doing* them as *placing our happiness in them*, *doing* them *customarily*, *considerately*, *covetously*, as men *unregenerate* do them; it is true, the *doing* of them, implies what you pretend [the Dominion, or predominancy of the flesh in the doers of them.] But men may be said *to do the works of the flesh*, in a *lower* way, as *now* and *then*, *inconsiderately*, *against* their *constant* course, to *do* them so, as to be not so *active*, as *passive* in them; to *do* them upon the *sudden*, and so to *do* them, as to look on themselves as *undone* by *doing* them; and *such a doing of the works of the flesh*, though it implie [a dominion, and predominancy of the flesh;] yet but [a dominion] by *usurpation*, not *consent*, or *full submission* [a predominancy] for the *time*, not for *ever*. And such [a Dominion and predominancy of the flesh,] we yield in sins of *infirmity*, and hold it very consistent with a *great proportion of grace*; yea the *greatest* that *any man on earth* hath attained to. Nor doth such [a Dominion or Predominancy of the flesh] imply any thing which hath no place in sins of infirmity. Yea but [the Apostle clearly insinuates, the nature of sins of infirmity, in that to the Galatians, *Gal. 2. Brethren, if any man be overtaken with a fault*, προλημφθῇ ἐν τινι παραπτώματι, *i. e.* be *prevented*, or *taken at unawares*, in or with some miscarriage or sin, *You which are spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness*, &c. when a mans foot is taken in the snare of a temptation, only through a defect, in that spiritual watchfulness over himself and his waies, which he ought to keep constantly, and so sinneth contrary to the habitual and standing frame of his heart; this man sinneth out of infirmity. But he that thus sinneth, cannot in Scripture phrase, be said either to walk or live according to the flesh, or to doe the works of the flesh, or to doe the lusts or desires of the flesh; because none of these are any where ascribed unto, or charged upon true believers, but only upon such persons who are enemies unto God, and children of death.]

Be it so; then it seems *no believers do any of these*, and if they do *none of these*, then are *all* their sins, *sins of infirmities*; [their foot being only taken in the snare of a temptation, through defect of watchfulness over themselvs in their ways.] And so they sin [contrary to the habitual & standing frame of their hearts.] But yet I beseech you, whence comes this [defect of watchfulness?] Is it not a [predominancy of the flesh] that casts up such *vapours* as betray them to *drowsiness* and *dulness*? Were it not for this interposition of the *flesh*, raising some impertinent *conceits*, and slily diverting the soul from *spiritual thoughts*, the [*Temptation*] would soon be *discovered*; and being

dis-co-

discovered, and being *discovered*, be as surely *avoided*. Their [Feet] would not be taken in the [share] were their heads at leasure to look round about it; and their *heads* would not fail to do it, did not their *hearts* imploy them with other thoughts. Their [defect of spiritual watchfulness] argues a [predominancy] of carnal security. *Now* I pray consider, may not the *weaker*, in *some cases*, get the upperhand of the *stronger*? doth not the *weaker alwaies reagere ad luctam*, though never *ad victoriam*? Doth every foil argue a *conquest*? The [defect of spiritual watchfulness] argues a [predominancy] of carnal security: But a predominancy of carnal security, upon an *advantage*, and for a *fit*, infers not more then the *spirits non-working at the full*; not its *non being at all*. Who knows not that these *defects* occasion a *doubling* of their *watchfulness*? and these *slips of infirmity*, a *firmer standing*, a *faster walking* in the waies of godliness?

2. Say you, [If by sinning out of malice, they mean sinning with deliberation, with plotting, and contriving the method and means of their sinning, sinning against judgment, against the dictates of conscience, (and what they should, or can mean by *sinning out of malice*, but sinning upon such terms as these I understand not.) Certain it is that true believers, or at least such as were true believers before such sinning, may sin out of malice.] 1. It is not so much to be *denyed* as lamented, that true believers actually continuing such, may, and have sinned at this rate you mention. Yet was not this more in them, then *sinning out of infirmity*, and *contrary to the habitual* and *standing frame* of their heart, and meerly for want of that *watchfulness over themselves*, which they both ought, and were wont to have. Albeit they [deliberated about the method and means of their sinning;] yet but as men of stronger fancies may *plot* in their *dreams*. Here the *fancy* acts without being curbed by *reason*. There the *fleshly reason* acts, without being restrained by the *spirit*: But as when the *sleep is past*, *Reason* immediately discovers those actings of the *fancy* to be *ridiculous*, and to be *laughed* at; so when that *security* is over, the *spirit* represents those actings of the *fleshly reason*, as *sad*, and to be *mourned* for; and as *Reason* bids us be most *afraid of our selves*, when our *fancies* please themselves best in those *dreams*, which the more they seem to have of *discourse*, the more danger they threaten to *reason*; which hath cause to be jealous of *it self*, lest the *imagination*, which acts with such a shew of *reason without her* while we are *asleep*, do chance to attempt somewhat *against* her while we are *awake*; and the *strength of the fancy* suggests that to the *reason*, which may make it take better care of *it self*, and provide for the due securing of her *weakness* against that too *potent fancy*, which may chance to *overmaster* her: So the *spiritual wisdom* bids us look about, when she observes the *fleshly reason* so *active*, as to work when *she was at rest*, to *deliberate* while *she was dull*, to *plot methods of sinning*, while *she stood by* and took no notice, into what *wretched confusion* those *methods* would run; and upon a due observing of the *fleshly reasons plotting* and contriving the *methods* and *means of sins*, she stirs her self up to *counterplot* with the best of her industry, and grows the more *wary*, because of the peril she was in, by the *fleshly reasons outgoing her* in *plotting and contriving*.

2. But all this while, though believers in such cases may have [plotted methods and means of their sinnings;] yet have they had that *spirit* within them, which hath afterwards *counterplotted them*; and though these plottings have been *against* their *judgment*, yet *against judgment dormant*, not *executing its decrees*; *against* the *habitual*, not the *actual* dictates of the conscience; the conscience *not interposing*, or but *heedlesly against* them; but as soon as *she apprehends it*, and the *spirit appears*, all these *fleshly plots, methods*, hide the head

Si forte virum quem
Conspexere, silent, demissisque auribus astant.

There are these eminent differences between a *regenerate* mans *plottings* in this kind, and an *unregenerate* mans. 1. That the *Regenerate* man hath *that within him*, which *husheth* all these actings of *fleshly reason*, by the bare proposing of the *grace of God in Jesus Christ*, and his redeeming him from *torments* in *hell*, and *vain conversation on earth*: The *Unregenerate* man *pursues* his projects in the *face of these truths*. Possibly

a

a *thought of the presence of God*, and his *wrath ready to be revealed from heaven*, may now and then cast some *damp on his projects*: but the consideration of the *mercy of God, never*. 2. That the *Regenerate* man needs *no other fleshly reasonings* to beat back *these*, that are *met* to *deliberate and project the method* and *means of sinning*, (which *alone* do usually prevail to this purpose in men *unregenerate*) but in spight of *all fleshly reasonings whatsoever*, he repels them all with the consideration of the *love of God in Christ*, the *the unworthiness of his doing* ought directly *against the commandment of God* who pleased to shew him so much love in Christ, the *becomingness* of *suffering evil in doing well*; and such other like thoughts which use not to fall under the *caps of men unregenerate*.

This premised, all that you add out of *Paræus* of [Sin sometimes reigning in the Regenerate] weighs little. It reigns *sometimes* in them as a *Tyrant*, *never* as a *King*, whom they either *elect*, or *own*. This sin, notwithstanding, may exclude [*actualem fiduciam remissionis peccatorum*] but *actualis fiducia* in respect of *actus primi* may remain, when *actualis fiducia* in respect of *actus secundi* is lost. They may obey as out of fear, never as out of duty; or as some being under a force pay tribute, but scarcely till they commit a distraining. So may this sin prevail, as to make waste of their consciences, and to make a fearfull havock upon them; and yet all the while not get them to swear *obedience*. Nor doth this contradict what *Paræus* subjoins, [That they are not guilty of contemning of God in it.] *Neglect* him they do, [contemn him] they do not: They do indeed *despise* his commandment *negatively*, not *positively*. And if in this sense of *Reigning sin* [*Ursin* say, that *Regenerate men* may *ruere in peccatum regnans*] he means no more, then that this sin doth so *ruere* upon them, as to force them to *yield*, not to *give up a full possession of themselves* to it. Now what if [those of the *Contra-Remonstrancie*, in the Conference at the *Hague*, confess and teach, *that true believers may fall so far, that the Church according to the commandment of Christ shall be obliged to pronounce that she cannot tolerate them in her external communion, and that they shall have no part in the kingdom of Christ, except they repent?*] Why, [therefore certainly their sense is, that true Believers may sin above the rate of those who sin out of infirmity; in as much as there is no command of Christ, that any Church of his should eject such persons out of their external communion, who sin out of infirmity only.] Yes, the Church in many cases looks rather to the *nature of the act*, then the *quality of the offender*; and the *act* being *scandalous*, she hath reason to proceed with this *severity* against it, *till the Offender redeem it by an humble acknowledgment*; with which, whatever the offence be, the Church is to rest satisfied, so as to receive the offender, though never so great, in again, whom till such acknowledgment be made, she is bound to reject. Nor doth it follow, [that because she is bound to judge them for ever excluded from the kingdom of heaven, without repentance, therefore their faith in Christ is totally lost by the committing of such sins.] *Every sin without repentance* excludes from *heaven*, it doth not therefore eject *faith*; but *faith remaining* ejects that *sin by repentance*, which *without repentance* would exclude from *heaven*. It is true, [there is no exclusion from the kingdom of God unto those that are by faith in Jesus Christ] but it is false what you add, [Whether they repent, or no.] *Faith* doth not help them from being *excluded from heaven*, but by *ejecting sin by repentance*; which because it doth not *immediately* do upon the committing of sin, so *long* sin keeps them from *heaven*. They stand not in need of repentance to give them a new *right* and *title* to heaven, but they do to give them *possession*, as it were, *livery* and *seisin*.

Your Conclusion is after the rate of the premisses of your Discourse, [To pretend, that however the Saints may fall into great and grievous sins, yet they shall certainly be renewed again by Repentance before they dye; though this be an assertion without any bottom of reason or truth, yet doth it no ways oppose, but suppose rather a possibility of the total defection of faith in true believers.]

1. If it did suppose such a *total* defection, yet is not *that* the point in question, but a *final* defection. 2. It doth not suppose a *total* defection: for doth *Repenting*, trow you, suppose *non-believing?* or *renewing by repentance*, a *total defection by non-believing?*

believing? *Renewing* relates to the *accidental*, as well as the *eſſential* form; and ſuppoſeth only a *precedent blemiſhing* of *that*, not a *total aboliſhing* of *this*. You may *renew* your *eſtate* in a Tenement, I truſt, *before all your term* be *expired*; have a *new leaſe* for *more years*, yet *hold* it for the *years* which are *not yet run out*. The *new leaſe* only *adds more*, doth not *abate of what you had aſſured to you before*; and albeit you *deliver* up your *old leaſe* before you have a *new*, yet your *new leaſe* properly *begins* where the *old ceaſeth*; and if having an eſtate for *one and twenty years*, whereof *fifteen* are *expired*, you take a *new* one for *one and twenty*, I am deceived, or you are ſo wiſe as to compound only for *fifteen*, though your *new leaſe* run for *one and twenty*. *Renewing* (my good old Doctor!) doth not ſuppoſe *aboliſhing*; nay more, *renewing* ſuppoſeth a *non-aboliſhing*: As when I *renew* my *old Caſſock*, (as I have and ſhall be fain to do oftner, as the world is like to go here at *Bliſland*) I do not *make* a *new one*, but *repair* an *old one*; which if it be abſolutely *worn out*, is neither worth, nor capable of *renewing*. You that can *renew* nothing but what is *totally periſhed*, can never *renew* your *hoſe*, till it be not only out at *heels*, but have never a *whole thread in it*; and ſuch a one may ſerve for a *Night-cap* for you, when you ſtudy next to *renew* your Argument in this Section.

In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas
Corpora. Or as *Scaliger* mends the matter, forſooth:
Quas mutata novas immotis corpora formis,
Induerunt ſpecies, ſe ut mirarentur in illis.

God is ſaid to *renew* the *face* of the *earth*; Can you find it in your heart to think the *earth* had loſt its *old face*? I humbly conceive the *face* of the earth had but loſt its *old beauty*. Here *renewing* ſignifies an *addition of ſomwhat new*, doth not ſuppoſe an *aboliſhing of all that was before*, in the *old face of the earth*. Nay ſomtimes *renewing* ſignifies not ſo much as an *addition*, but only a *lopping off* of ſome part of what was *old*, leaving the reſt: As when you and I *renew* our *beards*, which I take it is done only by *cutting off* their *irregular excreſcencies*, and ſo reducing them to the ſame eſtate they were in a moneth before. If *renewing* always ſuppoſe a *total defection*, the very Man in the Moon would ſay we have been at a fault in talking ſo familiarly of a *New Moon*, which we are not like to ſee in haſte, as often as we have had the luck to ſee a *New World*. *Renew* the edge of this Argument as much as you will, it will *retain the old ſubſtance*, which, we were wont to ſay, *non agit per ſe*: ſo little cauſe have we to fear it, unleſs it be aſſiſted with ſome accidental additions, which as yet I cannot dream of. SECT. 24.

You haue a mind to ſhew more of your ſtrength againſt thoſe who hold the Saints ſin not but out of infirmity. [Some, to maintain this Poſition (you obſerve) lay hold on this ſhield. *Such men as theſe never ſin with their whole wills, or with full conſent: Therefore when they ſin, they never ſin but through infirmity.* That they never ſin with full conſent, they conceive they prove ſufficiently from that of the Apoſtle; *For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but ſin that dwelleth in me*, Rom. 7. 19, 20. To this you anſwer, or rather object againſt it,

1. That the Saints oft ſin with their whole wills, or full conſents, is undeniably proved; becauſe otherwiſe there ſhould be not only a plurality or diverſity, but even a contrariety of wills in the ſame perſon, at one and the ſame inſtant of time, *viz.* when the ſuppoſed act of ſin is produced. Now it is an impoſſibility of the firſt evidence, that there ſhould be a plurality of acts, and theſe contrary one to another, in one and the ſame ſubject or agent, at one and the ſame inſtant of time.]

But, 1. why may we not diſtinguiſh between *Subjectum quo*, and *Subjectum quod*; or as they uſe to expound theſe terms, the ſubject of *inheſion*, and the ſubject of *denomination*?

1. That there can be contrary acts at one and the ſame time, in the ſame ſubject *quod*, or *denomination*, is beyond all doubt; the *ſame* ſubject *quod* having *diverſe*

faculties acquainted with *contrary qualities*, which may well enough be admitted to produce *contrary acts* or *operations*; and ſo the *ſpirit* and the *fleſh* in the *ſame man* may at one and the ſame time produce *contrary acts*, yet the *man* be but *one and the ſame*. Juſt as we ſee the *rational appetite* acts one way, and the *ſenſitive* another, in the *ſame man* at the *ſame time*.

2. But we will ſuppoſe the *will of man* to be the ſubject *quo* of your two contrary acts now in queſtion; who I pray ſaid that *either* of them might not conſiſt with *either in gradibus remiſſis*, albeit in *intenſis* they cannot ſtand together? The *will*, though it be a *ſimple faculty*, yet is guided by the *underſtanding*, which may at once *apprehend two contrary objects*, and *compare* them together: what if in this caſe, the *will* be at once carried to *both* thoſe objects, though to *neither fully* and *intirely*; to the *one* as promiſing *temporal*, to the *other* as *eternal* good and happineſs? And ſo indeed

3. Here is *really* but *one* act, though there *ſeem* to be *two*; and but *one mixt act*, though you are pleaſed to look upon them as *two contrary acts*.

4. It is I hope enough to bear us out, in ſaying, *the Saints act not in their ſins with their full will or conſent*; that their *will* or *conſent*, is not to the *higheſt*, though it be not *abated* by a *contrary act* of *will* or *conſent*, or *diſſent*, but by an *apprehenſion* of ſomewhat in the *contrary object*, which makes the *will* or *conſent* not to be ſo *full* as otherwiſe it would have been. What think you of a man throwing his *goods* overboard to ſave his life ἴσον ἀνέχονται ὦ θυμῷ? The *ſpirits* acting and the *fleſhes* acting, make the *will* to act at a *lower rate* then it would have done, had but *one of theſe principles* any influence upon it. Here we put *two acts*, one of the *ſpirit*, another of the *fleſh*; but need not ſay, the *will* hath more then *one act only*: that act is ſaid to be *ſpiritual*, when the influence of the *ſpirit* prevails; *carnal*, when that of the *fleſh*; but the *ſpiritual* act is *partly carnal*, becauſe *not fully ſpiritual*, by reaſon of the cloggings of the *fleſh*; and the *carnal act* is not ſo *carnal* as it would have been, had it not been for the *reſiſtance of the ſpirit*. And therefore, albeit I dare not call it *ſpiritual*, the *ſpiritualneſs* never giving *denomination* but where it *prevails*; yet may I ſafely ſay, the *Spirit* may be *obſerved to check it from running on a full carreer in carnality*. But it ſeems you aim at a further ſubtilty, and ſuch as every Corniſh-man is not capable of.

Marrie, [When the fleſh having prevailed in the combat, bringeth forth her deſire into act, the ſpirit ceaſeth from his act of luſting; otherwiſe it will follow that the fleſh is greater and ſtronger in her luſtings, then the ſpirit of God is in his; and that when the fleſh luſteth after the perpetration of ſuch or ſuch a ſin, the ſpirit, as to the hindring of it, luſteth but in vain; which is contrary to that of the Apoſtle, *Greater is he that is in you*, ſpeaking of the ſpirit of God in true believers, *then he that is in the world*. Meaning, Satan and all his Auxiliaries, Sin, Fleſh, Corruption; *&c.*]

And is he ſo indeed? Good news (I aſſure you) out of your Reverend mouth, and ſuch as puts me in hope, you will at laſt come over to us again, and crie *peccavi* for this your Digreſſion againſt the common Doctrine of Perſeverance: For conſider, if [the ſpirit in true believers be ſo much greater then Satan and all his Auxiliaries, ſin, fleſh, corruption, *&c.*] why ſhould you not acknowledg that [Satan, and all his Auxiliaries, ſin, fleſh, corruption, *&c.*] ſhall not be able to overcome the ſpirit in true believers? Is it ſo, that [the ſpirit in true believers is ſo much ſtronger] and yet is fain to quit his Manſion to thoſe who are ſo much *weaker* [as are Satan and all his Auxiliaries, ſin, fleſh, corruption, *&c.*] The *ſtronger* was not wont to go out, till a *ſtronger then he came*, and *vi & armis* by main force ejected him.

—— Fruſtra
Bacchatur vates magno ſi pectore poſſet
Excuſſiſſe Deum, ſtimulis ille acrius urget.

You will not ſay, I am ſure, that the *ſpirit goes off*, as ſoon as the *fleſh riſeth againſt him*; if he *ſtay the brunt of the firſt onſet*, it is not for the honour of his *power* to let the

the *flesh* carry the *victory*; shortly, upon your grounds, you must needs assert one of these things; Either that the *spirit goes away before the flesh prevail*, out of pure discontent; or else that he *staies*, and will not *act*, but suffers himself to be *removed*, or else that he *staies without his full power*, discouraged by oppositions; or else that he *staies & retains & exerts his power*; but that *power cannot master the flesh*; make what you will of it, either you must deny that the *power of the spirit is greater then that of the flesh*, or that if *his will* be proportionable to *his power*, and manage it to the best advantage, *the Saints do never totally and finally fall away*. So much have you gotten by alleadging this Scripture.

Yea but say you, [The reason why the flesh so frequently prevaileth, is, because the spirit acts not, at least to the just efficacy of his vigor and strength, but only when his preventing or first motions are entertained or seconded, with a suitable concurrence, by the hearts and wils of men; through a deficiency or neglect whereof, he is said to be *grieved* or *quenched*: *i. e.* to cease from other actings, or movings in men.] It seems then the spirit is *never grieved* or *quenched* by the *Saints*: for, if [the spirit be *not grieved* or *quenched*, but when his preventing or first motions are neglected, and not suitably entertained,] then is he not grieved or quenched by *any Saints*; for if they had not [suitably entertained his preventing and first motions,] they had not been *Saints*. Now 2. supposing them of course to have [suitably entertained his first movings,] whence comes it that the flesh prevails *afterwards*, the *spirit being greater*, and not being occasioned to omit to act according to his just efficacy and vigor? It seems he may be grieved by their neglect of giving him *suitable entertainment afterwards*, and I acknowledg it, yet not so as to *depart*, or *forbear to exert his power again*, so as to *subdue those corruptions* which had *grieved him*. SECT. 25.

Well but [This truth is the ground of these and such like sayings in the Writings of *Paul*, *If ye through the spirit do mortifie the deeds of the body, ye shall live*; *for as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God*. Believers do then *mortifie the deeds of the body by the spirit*, when they joyn their wills unto his, in his preventing motions of grace, and so draw or obtain further strength and assistance from him, in order to the great and difficult work of mortification.] We think it more honourable to say, *God joyns their wils to himself*, then that [they joyn their wils unto his.] *Knit my heart unto thee*, saith *David*, *that I may fear thy name*. Nor are the Saints said to be *led by the spirit*, to exclude *his drawing*, but to shew their *own following*, though it be more in *his strength* then *their own*; nor are they said to be *filled with the spirit* so much in respect of their *own comportment with him*, as *his more plentiful effusions upon them*, which yet I grant ever carry them to such a [comportment.] You proceed.

[By what hath been said, it clearly appears, that the reason why believers are so frequently overcome by the lustings of the flesh, notwithstanding the contrary lustings of the spirit within them, before their foil, is not because the flesh hath more strength to lust then the spirit; but because they, the men-believers, have more will to hearken unto, and to go along with the flesh.]

But whether the flesh *have* more or less strength to lust, then the spirit, it is clear in this case, it *puts forth more strength*, else how comes the believers will to be more ready to follow the *flesh* then the *spirit*? *Believers have* (say you elsewhere) *as great an aversion from destroying sins, as ordinary men have from destroying their lives*; Whence comes it now, that [they are more inclined to follow the flesh then the spirit?] if the flesh doe not lust more strongly? Nay whence comes this [greater readinesse to follow the flesh,] but from the *fleshes greater power* over their *wills*?

[It is true (say you) after such desertions of the spirit, in his motions, by the wils of men, he doth not always, wholly, and for ever desert them, but most frequently returns again in his motions and excitements unto them. Only in his first applications unto men, after he hath been so deserted by them, as hath been said, he doth not, I conceive, begin where he left, but where he began first of all; my meaning is, that he doth not move, or act them at any such high or filling rate, as at which he

wrought, or was ready to work, when he was forſaken; but according to the line or proportion of his preventing motions, which generally are of a cooler and ſofter inſpiration then his ſubſequent.

But if he work at the rate [*as he did at firſt*] by your leave, he *works more ſtrongly*: for that there being *more oppoſition at firſt* then *afterwards*, the *fleſh* being broken *afterward*, and in his full ſtrength at *firſt*; unleſs the ſpirit wrought more ſtrongly at *firſt*, there had been no *entrance* made by it: It is true, the working of the Spirit as to the *terminus ad quem*, carries it *further afterwards*; but the *taking it off* from the *terminus à quo* requires *more ſtrength*. Nor is it ſo much to make the *mobile* move *faſter* when as it is once engaged in *motion*, then it is to make it *move at all*, when as before it was at *full reſt*, or *moved* the quite *contrary way*.

Upon the whole you conclude, [It is an apparent error to ſay, the Saints never ſin with their whole wills, or fulneſs of conſent.] The *laſt* of your paſſage, for ought I ſee, contributeth nothing at all to prove this to be an error. For what is this? [God doth not work upon them after their ſinning, at ſo high a rate as he did before: *Ergo*, They ſin with their whole conſent.] You might have inferred as well, *The Cart goes rumble to rumble over Botley-cauſey*. Well, but you will make this error more apparent in your next bout. 1. By the [example of *David*, who queſtionleſs had no renitencie within him, upon the commiſſion of thoſe two foul ſins, of Adultery and Murther,] *vid. Chap.* 14. & *Chap.* 11. 2. [By *Peter Martyr's* teſtimony, *Quod ad eos Sanctos attinet, perpetuo agerent in ſordibus, niſi Deus potenti verbo eos educeret.*] Nay, but if his *Word* be ſtrong enough to do it, ſure the *Spirit* ſtill remains in them; for elſe they would ſcorn both *him* and his *word*. This ſhews what *means* the *Spirit* uſeth to bring them *out* of *their ſins*; doth not prove that the *Spirit remains not in them notwithſtanding their ſins*. Yea, but [were any part of their wills bent againſt the committing of the ſin, at the time when it is committed, they would queſtionleſs return to themſelves, and repent immediately after, the heat and violence of the luſt being over, by reaſon of the ſatisfaction that hath been given to it.] But is [the heat and violence of the luſt] ſo ſoon over, as the *act* is committed? or doth it ſo ſoon [receive ſatisfaction?] I ſhould think *luſt* is rather *increaſed* then *reſtrained* by its actings; and is ſo far from being [ſatisfied] that it is *inſatiable*. Luſt rather *inflames it ſelf* by its *actings*; *& finis unius mali, gradus eſt futuri*. Even when it cannot *act* any more, it is ſo far from *ſitting* down in [ſatisfaction] that it is impatient of its *inability* to *act further*; and though it cannot *flame outwardly*, it *burns* the more *inwardly*. Luſt is an *unreaſonable thing*, and knows no [ſatisfaction] at all: When it cannot vent it ſelf in *acts*, it doth by *words*; when its *mouth* is *gagged*, its *heart* is as *free* as ever: It may be *ſubdued*, it cannot be [ſatisfied.] When did *Covetouſneſs* ſay, *it is enough?* All *luſts* are *ſiſters*, the *daughters of the ſame horſe-leach*, and are for *more ſtill*; the more *barren* their *wombs* are, the more they *long* to *bring forth*. Did not the *Spirit* of God *curb* them, they would never ſit down *contented* with any thing that ſhould pretend to give them the fulleſt [ſatisfaction.] Every luſt is much of the ſame making with *Meſſalina's*:

Et laſſata viris, necdum ſatiata receſſit.
——Hinc fiunt octo mariti,
Quinque per Autumnos——
——Necdum triceſima lux eſt,
Et nubit decimo jam Thileſina viro.
Tune duos unâ, ſaviſſima vipera, canâ;
Tune duos? ſeptem, ſi ſeptem forte fuiſſent.
Quo plus ſunt potæ, plus ſitiuntur aqua.
——Adultera lege eſt
Offendor, mœcha ſimpliciore minus.

I wonder that any man ſhould ſpeak of the [ſatisfying of luſt.] When it is grown *old*, it caſts about how to make it ſelf *young again*; it knows how to recall the time paſt

paſt ſo far back, as to pleaſe it ſelf with the *remembrance* of that *act* which it cannot *repeat*; it knows how to metamorphoſe a *ſin of the fleſh* into one of the *ſpirit*. Shortly, the weaker its *abilities* are, the ſtronger and more impetuous are its *deſires*; like an *Eunuch embracing a Virgin*. I remember a certain law: *Sunt qui poſſunt, ſed non cupiunt; ſunt qui cupiunt, ſed non poſſunt.* Nay, how doth its deſires tranſport it many times, like a *Virgin longing* for that which we would think ſhe ſhould *loath*, as to eat *Oatmeal*, and *Lime*, and *worſe*, when ſhe hath no ſtomach forſooth to *Partridges* or *Pheaſants*; and to enjoy the company of a good luſty *Groom*, when (may it pleaſe you) ſhe cannot find it in her heart to comply with the deſires of her father, commending her beyond her merit to a *Man of Honour*.

Luſt (Good Doctor!) is a thing of ſo *ſtrange workings*, that you (as much wit as I ſtill acknowledge you to have, above the rate of moſt of thoſe wiſe men that deſpiſe your parts) will find it as hard a task to trace her, as *Solomon* (who I ſuppoſe was your Peer) did to *find the way of a man with a maid*. Luſt knows how to wipe her mouth, after ſhe hath liberally enough eaten; and leave no more ſign, then if ſhe had not *taſted a morſel*. She knows how to make up her mouth at *table*, as if ſhe could not *eat* and it were to ſave her *life*; and yet fall to it *behind the door*, as if ſhe had been kept from meat with as much care and diligence, and more, then ever *Nuns* were from the company of *Friars*. Luſt knows how to look *demurely*, and as if, as we ſay, *Butter would not melt in her mouth*; when all the while ſhe *burns* with a ſecret *deſire*, and would gladly *run through fire and ſword* to find an opportunity to *fulfill it*. Luſt knows how to *frown* on her *delight*, and yet *caſt a ſheeps eye on it over her ſhoulder*, which may give it a full aſſurance that ſhe but *puts it off*, to *draw it on*; and *diſcourageth* it, to *hearten* it to a fuller *expectation* from her, and *endeavour* for her according to proportion. Luſt is a *Sophiſter*, that hath more *fallacies* then you or I with all our Logick can diſcover *ex tempore*; and a *Rhetorician*, that can put the *faireſt colours* on the *foulеſt buſineſs*, and as *foul* ones on the *faireſt*. She is apt to make ſhew ſhe is [ſatisfied] when ſhe is moſt *eager* and *violent*; as finding ſhe can *go further* by pretending to *ſit ſtill*: but ſtill when ſhe is gone *furtheſt*, ſhe hath *further to go*, then ſhe hath *gone*; and is unwilling to *give over*, even when ſhe cannot ſtir a foot *further*.

Nor is this the caſe of *one luſt* alone: Not only the luſt which drew *David* to commit *adultery*, but that which drew him on to commit *murther*, was of the ſame genius, both right of a piece. I do not dream that it was *revenge* that put him on that *murther*; but ſure that *murther* would have put him on the *fear of revenge*, and the *fear of revenge* would have whiſpered him, he ſhould do well to play a *foregame*, and *deſtroy* as *many* as were like to *endanger himſelf*. That *one murther* could not be *ſafe*, but by *more*; and every one of thoſe that ſhould have *ſucceeded* would have told the *ſame tale*, and given him the *like counſel* to ſecure himſelf by *new bloodſhed*, till he had *left not one that piſſeth againſt the wall*, that was likely to caſt a *ſtone* againſt him.

Shortly, No luſt is ever [ſatisfied:] You wil as ſoon *ſatisfie* all the *Objections* that can be made by others againſt *your Book*, as you can *ſatisfie* any *one luſt* by all the *anſwers* you can make to it, though you write never ſo *many volumes* to this purpoſe. Luſt is that which Reaſon hath ſometimes *ſuppreſſed*, could never *ſatisfie*: And the more is the glory of *Grace*, which *conquers luſt by power*, whereas it would yield to no perſwaſion. Were it not that the *Spirit of God* did *change the heart*, the *heart* would ſtill be *challenging the Spirit*; yea, and when the *Spirit* hath moſt *changed* it, the leaſt *remainders of luſts* would *recover* themſelves ſo well, as *to beat out the Spirit*, did it *act by leſs then an omnipotent power*.

Having thus caſt in an Objection againſt our Argument from *Rom.* 7. 19. whence we eſſay to prove, as you ſay, *that the Saints never ſin with their whole wills or full conſent*; you come now to anſwer, and SECT. 26.

1. You ſay [Negatively, That when the Apoſtle ſaith, *The evil which I would not, that I do*; his meaning is not, that he did that, which at the ſame time when he did it, he was not willing either in whole or in part to do.] Let him be willing [in part]

part] by my *full consent*, doth that prove, that he did sin with [*his whole will, and full consent*?]

This is the Proposition which you pretend to answer to, *The Saints never sin with their whole wils or full consent.* Your answer to this Proposition is, [*Paul* saith not, that when he did sin, he was not willing, either in whole or in part.] I will be your Compurgator, you speak no contradiction in this; but you must be content to speak so as to *contradict us* and our *Proposition*, if you mean to *confute* us. If you do not *contradict* us, we may save the labour of replying upon you. My Masters of the Congregation of *Colemanstreet*, I ingenuously acknowledg, you can never enough admire the new Logick of your old Doctor, who hath found out a rare way to overthrow our assertion, *That the Saints do not sin with their whole wils, and full consent*; by telling us, to our shame, they may sin [with part of their will] which is as much as if to prove *your whole Congregation is not gone off from Mr.* Goodwin; you should alleadg, *that there is a part of it which doth depart from him.* Well, doubting these may not be brought to vote against Mr. *Goodwin*, with their whole will and full consent, though questionless they will *in part*; I apply my self to Dr. *Whichcote*, and the rest of his Reverend Brethren of *Cambridge*, not doubting in the *least part*, but they will *with their whole will, and full consent*, determin on *my side*, that Mr. *Goodwin* speaks at no better rate in this passage, then if to confute this, *That the Fellows of* Queens *Colledg will not with their whole will and full consent, chuse him for their Master in case that Headship should be void*; he should gravely alleadg, *That a part of the Fellows there*, suppose one or two, (whereas the whole number may perhaps be forty) *will give him their voices*: were I of that society, he should have *mine* with *my whole will and full consent*, if ever he make this good, that *to prove* Paul *did sin with part of his will*, doth prove they say false, who say, *neither* Paul, *nor any other Saint did sin with his whole will, and full consent.*

[2. Positively, but that he sometimes did that upon a surprisal by temptation, or through incogitancy, which he was not habitually willing, or disposed in the inner man to do.]

1. Be it so; but if [he were not habitually willing,] I pray was there not somewhat like a *disposition* at least to *unwillingness*? and whatever it were, though never so *little*, that renders his sin to be *less* then *with his full will and consent*. 2. How can it be so, that you should satisfie your self, with saying [*Paul* means no more then that he was not habitually willing to do the evil which he did] when he saith that which carries he was *habitually unwilling*? I trust there is room enough for your wit to walk between these two, *not habitually willing*, & *habitually unwilling*, or these, *habitually not willing*, and *not habitually willing*. As if I say, Mr. *Goodwin hath not a habit of writing well*; I speak not so much according to the merit of his Books, as if I said *he hath a habit of writing not well*; and when I say *he hath a habit of writing not well*, speak not so high as I do if I say, *he hath a habit of writing ill.* There may be a medium between *ill* and *not well*; *i.e. passably*, like *Hearb-John*, as they say, in the *pottage-pot* that doth neither *good* nor *harm.* Now it is evident the Apostle speaks not as if he were meerly *non-habitually willing*; but that he was *habitually unwilling*, yea not so only *non volendo*, but *nolendo*, which is one step more, *the evil which I would not*; as *serving in my mind the Law of God*, as *groaning under the tyranny of the law in my members*, as *esteeming my self a wretched man because of the body of death which I carry about me*, as *using means to prevent it*, as *usually moaning when I am surprized by it.* Well but in spight of all that shal be said to the contrary, [this no way implies but that at the time when he did the evil he speaks of, he did it with the full and intire consent of his will;] but I ask, did he it with *as much willingness* as *before he was regenerate*? If you say yea; then sure *St.* Paul *fell totally from grace*, (which is more then I suppose you will presume to charge upon him) and sins at *as great a height after his calling*, as *before*; if *not*, then *did he not sin with the full and intire consent of his will*; any the *smallest abatement* shews it to be *no full consent.* And now, though I endeavour to save the *honour of* Pauls *Saintship*; yet I need not fear, lest I do too much for the honour of [*Herod*, *Pilat*, yea and probably *Judas* himself,] none of them all may hope to be

[brought

[brought upon this account into the list or roll of the Saints.] 1. For I do not speak as if *any contrary bent of his will at other times*, yea, or the *time whiles* Paul *sinned*, proved him to be a *Saint*; or if non-fulness of consent in sinning did disprove any man from being a *wicked wretch*. I consider the *ground* of this *bent of* Pauls *will*, and find it to be as distant from that of *Herod's* and *Pilate's*, and the rest of wicked men, as *heaven* is from *earth*. [A Reluctancie in them] is yielded: but a Reluctancie meerly upon *Principles of a lower sphere*, and which look no further then *themselves*; not of that *high* and *heroical nature* that *those* were, which led *Paul* beyond the *consideration of his own interest*, to *the glory of his Saviour*. Of this see more *Chap.* 11. *Sect.* 29, &c. Yet to speak somwhat to your particulars,

SECT. 25.

First for *Herod's*: It is granted, [he gave not commission for the beheading of *John* the Baptist with fulness of consent.] But *that* which made him consent *against his mind*, should have *turned his mind* further off from all thoughts of consenting; and therefore shewed the *wickedness of his heart* that was led to consent, by *that* which *especially should have wrought in it a just abhorrencie* of so *barbarous a murther*. For *the Oaths sake, and them that sate with him at meat, he commanded it to be given her*, Mar. 14.8,9. 1. What thoughts had *Herod* of an *Oath*? An *Oath* should have put him in mind of *God*: God could not be in his mind, but *Gods love to good men*, especially to *John*, must presently fall into his thoughts: *Gods love to John* could not fall into his thoughts, but he must needs have as great apprehensions of *Gods wrath ready to light on him that should lift his hand against so dear a servant of his*, especially to take off his reverend head, and lay it at the feet of a wanton Lady. The thought of *John* the Prophet, and this same Court-Dame, must needs remember him of what *wrath and judgments from God John* had threatned to him for his *abominable conversing* with the incestuous Mother of this light-footed Hussife. He could not but immediately conclude, that the *Mothers hand* was in the *Daughters petition*, and that *she was so wroth with John*, meerly because *John had shewed how wroth God was with him* for *bearing too much love to her*. Now if he *believed what* John *had said*, how comes it to pass he was not *more sorry* that she had *tempted him to do that* which would draw *more wrath on him*; yea, and to *take him off, who would have shewed him how to flie from the wrath of God*? It is evident, a due thought of God, of *John*, of *Herodias*, would have been a means of great efficacie to have taken him off from this *murther*. And this of *an Oath* would have done more towards it. Must he not needs argue thus with himself: If I be afraid of the *wrath of God for not making good this Oath*, how much more cause have I to fear his wrath *for doing that which God himself hath sworn he will revenge*? To add *murther* to *incest*, is to *treasure up more wrath against the day of wrath*. My *Oath* cannot *oblige me* to *provoke God*: it cannot bind me to *do evil to John*; and *such an evil* to *John*, as can bring *no good to Herodias*, or *her daughter*; unless they look on *this* as *good*, to *do wickedly without hearing of it*, to *do evil without being told they shall suffer evil*. But the *Oath* which should have *taken him off*, *drew him on* to his sin. *For his Oath sake*, alas, *he doth it*. This shews a *difference* between the [renitencie] of *Herod*, and the Saints. The truth is, *Herod* had a [renitencie] because of the *fear of men*, who did many honour *John*; not for *fear of God*. The Saints have a [renitencie] for *love of God*: the *least thought of God* checks them, as we see in *Davids* case. *Herod* is *provoked* to his sins, by *thinking on the oath of God*; and it seems by the carriage, he made use of the reverence of an *Oath* meerly for *politick ends*. *For the oaths sake, and them that sate with them at meat, he commanded &c.* It seems to me he might have an apprehension, that if he *slighted his oath to a subject*, his subjects would think the more slightly of *their oaths to him*; and if *he* did not keep *his oath* in this case, though it did *not tie him*, he should *encourage* them to *break their oaths* where they did *tie* them.

Evident it is, here was no *renitencie* out of any *conscientious tenderness*, but meerly out of a *subtile consideration* of his *seeming interest*. But the Saints reluctancie is of another nature; they are never hardned to a *sin against the light of nature*, by consideration of an *oath*. It is true, their *eyes may be darkned*, and they may *swear* to do that which is *unlawfull*, and *prosecute* it the more because of their *oath*: but generally they

they are *afraid to ſwear to do that which is lawfull*, rather then *bold to do that which is unlawfull, becauſe they have ſworn.* And when they diſcover that they have *ſworn* to do what was *unlawfull*, they hold themſelves bound to *repent of their oath*, as much as to *abſtain from the act*, which they eſteem ſo much the *more ſinfull* as they *more ſolemnly bound* themſelves to it by ſo ſacred a tie, as is that of an *Oath*. *Herods* [penitency] ſhews his *ſin* to have been the *greater*, for that it was a *ſin againſt the light of his judgment*, and yet his *judgment continuing to dictate it to be a ſin*, was carried to *determine* the *acting* of it upon conſideration of ſo *holy a thing as an Oath*, which could not be done without *judging God to be an exactor of the ſin which his own judgment condemned.* The truth is, *Herods* whole demeanour ſhews him to have been a man *hardning himſelf againſt God and his own conſcience*, and even *blotting* out all principles of common *equity*, to ſatisfie his accurſed *luſts*. In a word, the Saints *luſts* may *blind their eyes*, ſo as to make them *forget God*; they do not *blind their eyes*, and *gratifie their luſts* upon the *remembrance of God*, as here *Herod* did: had *Herod* had the ſpirit of *David*, he would have found a means to have *ſav'd* Johns *head*, though it had *coſt him more then half his Kingdom*; and a *great deal leſs*, it is probable, would have preferred his young Damſel, beyond all her Ladiſhip could hope to be advanced to. Theſe which you call [temptations] to the ſin of *Herod*, were ſo many *arguments* againſt it; and the *laſt* in a way of *civil prudence*. For he ſhould have concluded thus; If theſe who now *ſit at meat with me*, find me ſo eaſily drawn to *cut off* Johns *head*, they have little cauſe to think their *own heads* ſo faſt on their ſhoulders, but any Madamoſeille, may dance them off the next time *Herod* hath a mind to a Mask. And thus ſhould *Herod* have ſaid, the *cutting off* Johns *head*, will be the *caſting down* of the *hearts* of all thoſe that *ſit at meat with me*; this *poor* Johns *head* wil *turn* their *ſtomacks* more then al the *other diſhes* can *pleaſe* their *palats*. Theſe then which you call [temptations] to the ſin, were rather ſuch *correctives* or *preſervatives* from it.

The like almoſt may be ſaid of *Pilate*, [a reluctancy] I yield; but ſuch as was not occaſioned by the *fear*, muchleſs the *love* of *God*, but meerly by the *dictates of his common reaſon*, which yet gave place to the *clamorouſneſs* of the Jews, and told him he ſhould do well to *comply with the multitude*, rather then *draw* their *rage*, and *Cæſars diſpleaſure* on him, by taking off an *accuſed innocent* from the malitious proſecutions of their implacable hatred. And upon a large debate concluded, he ſhould do well to expoſe not only a righteous man, but the holy Son of God to the fury of the Jews, though withall he did provoke the *wrath of God* againſt *himſelf*, by ſo doing, rather then to *leave himſelf* at the mercileſs *mercy* of the Jews, though he were *ſecured* by the *protection of God Almighty*. Sir, Theſe Caſes are nothing like that of *Davids*, or any other Saints. We put a viſible difference between the *reluctancy* that is in the *Saints*, and men *unregenerate*. *Unregenerate men* do as it were *weigh God* and their *ſin* in a ballance, and upon the beſt of their obſervation, they pronounce *for their ſin, againſt God*, as that which will deſerve better of them; and though the apprehenſions they have of God, may ſometimes *check* them from acting to the *height of their deſires* in gratifying the ſin; yet their *deſires*, the *leſs* they can obtain *liberty* to put themſelvs forth to the *acting* therein *ad extra*, the *more* they *ſtorm* and *rage* againſt the *greatneſs of God*, and *their own apprehenſions of it*, which do too powerfully reſtrain them. But men *regenerate*, are not wont to ſin, till their ſin have found a trick *to put God out of their thoughts for the time*, and aſſoon as the *thought of God returns*, the thought of God puts *all the thoughts which had been imployed in the ſervice of ſin*, to the bluſh. And albeit it be true, the *unregenerate part* in them, being according to proportion, as great an enemy againſt God, as the *corrupt hearts of men unregenerate*; do uſe all its ſlights to bring them to ſin in the *face* as it were of *thoughts of God*, yet can it not do it, till it have caſt a *vail over the face of them*, and when once the *vail* is a little taken aſide; the *regenerate part* begins to bethink it ſelf better, and *condemns it ſelf*, doth not caſt about to *juſtifie the ſin*. But of this more by and by; in the interim

I have a word or two to ſay to the ſecond piece of your Anſwer.

2. As to the paſſage in *Rom. 7.* I anſwer yet further, [That when the Apoſtle ſaith, *The evil which I would not, that I doe*, he doth not ſpeak of what he alwaies and in all

all cases did, much le ſs of what was poſſible for him to do, but of what he did ordinarily or frequently, or of what was very incident to him, through the infirmity of the fleſh, *viz.* through inconſiderateneſs and anticipation by temptations to do ſuch things, which whiles he was in a watchfull poſture, and free from the maligne influence of a tentation, he was altogether averſe unto.]

Be all granted you, what is this to *your benefit*, or *our diſadvantage*? let the Apoſtle ſpeak] not of what he alwaies did, nor of what was poſſible for him to do, but of what he did ordinarily, through the infirmity of the fleſh, and inconſiderateneſs, and anticipation by temptations. Doth this relate to his *would not*, or to his *I doe*? We are diſputing of his *non-willing what he doth*, rather then *his doing what he wils not*; our point is all, how far he *would not what he did*. Now though [his *doing what he would not* were *through infirmity*, *inconſiderateneſs*, *anticipation by temptations*;] yet I hope *his not willing what he did*, was not hence. I have much adoe to forbear flying out, but that I am reſolved not to be angry with this paſſage, or any of its fellows, of which it hath a fair number; conſidering how much I may be beholding to them, for ſaving me the *charge of Phyſick* againſt Melancholy, whereto I confeſs I am very ſubject, and owe the more to ſuch Ratiocinations as theſe upon the place.

It is true [what a man ordinarily doth, is one thing; and what he doth ſometimes, and in ſome particular caſe, eſpecially what it is poſſible for him to do, is another; that believers ſin not upon worſe terms, I eaſily grant; but it no ways follows from hence, that [*they never ſin upon others.*] This is ſomewhat yet, but not much, if you conſider that the Apoſtle here ſets *himſelf* forth as an example of the working of the fleſh and ſpirit in believers, whom he would have look upon him, ſo as to ſee *their own* corruptions in *his*, their *own graces* in the midſt of corruptions in *his*, and to judg of *themſelves*, ſo as to humble, ſo as to comfort themſelves according to *his pattern*. Sir, his *particular practice* is a *general pattern*; and therefore we may as well conclude that the ſpirit and the fleſh did alwaies work in him after this manner, as others could conclude they would ſtill work in *them*, as they did in *him*. From a *particular*, it is true, we cannot often conclude to a *general*; but we may where that *particular* is propounded as the *terms* of each *particular* under that *general*, which is the caſe here. This paſſage, *The evil which I would not, that I do*, though it be expreſſed [in the *preſent* tenſe,] yet carries the ſignification of the *future* tenſe, *I ſhall do thus while in the fleſh*; and of the *prater* tenſe, *I have done but thus* ever ſince I had the happineſs to receive the *Spirit*. Nay it hath nothing of the *preſent tenſe* properly in it, unleſs *Paul* while he *was writing theſe words*, did the evil which he would not; which is a word which no man either *can* make good, or *will* as much as undertake it, unleſs perhaps the good Gentleman at *Colemanſtreet* may be ſo far prevailed with at his better leaſure; in the mean time it is clear enough, this concerned *Paul* in the whole courſe of his pilgrimage after his *regeneration*, and will be appliable to *all regenerate men*, till the day of *redemption*. St. *Paul* ſpeaks of *all others* in *himſelf*, and not of *one particular ſin* in *one particular matter*, but of the *general manner of* the ſinning of *all believers*

You are now ready for no leſs then [*two* Objections at *once*, which are wont to be made againſt this your Argument and Doctrine, viz. *That it maimeth, or diſmembreth the body of Chriſt, and bringeth in an uncouth and unſeemly interchange and rechange of Members between Chriſt and the Devil. That it maketh regeneration iterable*, &c. You anſwer, that all theſe, with the like, are but pretended inconveniencies, and ſuch only to appearance; the Scripture juſtifieth them, and judgeth them no inconveniencies at all; yea it holdeth them forth as things neceſſary and comely in the inſtitutions and diſpenſations of God.]

It is, I confeſs [no unſeemly thing for Chriſt to take thoſe *who were members of the Devil*, and to make them *members of himſelf*, [he doth ſo by *every one of his members*; they were *all once members* of the *Devil*, namely in the ſtate of *nature*; *children of wrath*, and *members of the Devil*, are the ſame; but albeit Chriſt make *members of the Devil* to be *members of himſelf*, yet he leaveth none of *his own members* to be *members of the Devil*. Here is no ſuch] interchange and rechange of mem-

bers between Chriſt and the Devil] as you pretend. It is for Chriſts glory to have *members of the Devil* cut off, cleanſed, changed, and incorporated into his own body: here is an *addition* made to his body. But it were a *diminution* and *diſhonour* to his *body* to leave the Devil to tear off *his members* from him. Alas, ſir, Chriſt is too tender of the leaſt, and weakeſt, and inconſiderableſt of them, to part with them ſo. He who keepeth the very *hairs* of his *members*, will not loſe any *member* of his *body*: the *ſmalleſt* of them is as the *apple of his eye*; it is as dear to *him*, he is as tender of *it*. The *eye* cannot ſay to the moſt *diſhonourable* member, that *it hath no need of it*. Chriſt looks on the moſt *diſhonourable member*, as a *glory* to *his body*. He ſhews *his own power* in *its weakneſs*; and in nothing more, then in *enabling it* to hold its place in *his body* againſt the moſt *potent oppoſition*: ſo that though it be *ſlaſht* and *hacked*, it ſtill *hangs faſt*, though by a *ſmall* and *inſenſible skin*; and is at laſt *knit the faſter*, by the *danger* it was in of being *cut off*. And albeit the Devil may *ſævire, non in membra, ſed vulnera*; and bring it to that ſad paſs, that

Totum eſt pro vulnere corpus;
—quacunque foramina novit
Sudor, ab his ſanguis fluit.

Yet doth Chriſt take nothing the *leſs*, but rather the *more* care of it; and furniſheth it with ſuch a ſweet ſupply of gracious influences from his holy Spirit, that thoſe *ſemianimes artus* do ſtill *live*, and at length grow both the *ſtronger* and *fairer*. They have this to comfort themſelves with, that there is *ſome life*, becauſe there is *ſo much pain* in them; and when they *loſe moſt*, they may ſtill ſay this every one of them,

Parsque mei latitat corpore clauſa ſuo.

Can any man think, that Chriſt, who will have his body at laſt to be without *one wrinkle*, will be ſo careleſs of it, as to let it be without *ſome members*? There is not *a member of his body* can *ſuffer* on *earth*, but that he is *ſenſible* of it: and can you think he will endure that any of them ſhould be *tortured in hell*? Can the *Head* be well in *Heaven*, while the leaſt piece of a *finger* is in *hell*? Can you think it can ſtand with the honour of *Chriſt* the *head*, to have the Devil to wear his *limbs*? He whoſe *garment* was without a *ſeam*, will have his *body* to be without ſuch *rents*; and if he kept his *coat* from being *divided*, he will ſurely preſerve his *body* from being *diſmembred*. It were (doubtleſs) much for his honour, to have a *whole Coat*, and a *torne Body*.

But ſay you,

[1. For *diſmembring the Body of Chriſt*, Is it not the law of Chriſt himſelf, in every particular Church or body of his, that as any of their members putrifie, and diſcover themſelves to be rotten and corrupt, they ſhould be cut off by the ſpiritual ſword of Excommunication? And doth not ſuch a *diſmembring* as this, rather tend to the honouring and adorning the body of Chriſt, then any wayes to maim or deform it?]

1. It ſeems to me very improper to ſpeak, as if every *particular Church* were a [*particular body of Chriſt.*] I had thought Chriſt had had but *one body*, and that every *particular Church* had been but a *particular limb of that body*, conſiſting of *ſeveral members*. What is *one head*, and *many bodies*? As ſtrange a monſter as *one body*, with *many heads*.

2. What if [ſome members of a Church be cut off?] *all members* of a *true Church* are not *true members of Chriſt*. Members of Chriſt they are in *ſhew*, they are not in *reality*. Their *profeſſion* of the *faith*, makes *them look* like *members of Chriſt*; there muſt be a *ſincerity of profeſſion*, or Chriſt *looks not on them* as *members*. *Such members* are no more *true members*, then a *wooden arm* is a *true arm*. *We* who ſee a *wooden arm* covered with a *handſom ſleeve*, may conceive the *arm* to be as good as the *ſleeve* that covers it. *Chriſt* who hath *all things naked before him*, hath not, cannot have ſuch thoughts of it.

3. Nay,

3. Nay, what if ſome *whole Churches* profeſſing the *truth*, be cut off, as ſometimes they have been? Chriſt loſt nothing by it: *theſe Churches* were not *members of his body*, more then in *appearance*. *Viſible Churches of Chriſt* may be without any ſhare in the *inviſible Church*. A *Church of Chriſt* as to the *doctrine*, may be a *Synagogue of Satan* as to their *practice*; and *deny in their works*, what they *profeſs in their words*.

4. *Excommunication* cuts not off any *true member of Chriſt*; but by *ſtretching out the member*, helps to *ſet it better* and *ſaſter* in its *due place*. Pertinacouſneſs in an erroneous judgment, perverſneſs in an exorbitant carriage, may call for the ſtroke of Excommunication; the ſtroke of Excommunication doth not here *cut off*, but *cure* a *diſtempered member*. Excommunication is a *ſeparation from the ſociety of the faithfull*, not a *ſequeſtration from all communion with Chriſt*. Were *every excommunicated man cut off from Chriſt*, how comes *any excommunicated man* to *return* to him? Sure he is not *cut off* from the *Body* of Chriſt, while he is partaker of the *Spirit of Chriſt*: And I ſuppoſe he that *repents*, *repents* by the influence of Chriſts *Spirit*; which did he not partake off, it would not have any ſuch *operation* upon him.

Yea but [for ſuch a diſmembring of the Body of Chriſt, which the Doctrine in hand ſuppoſeth to be cauſable by the Members themſelves, as *viz.* by the voluntary diſ-faithing of themſelves through ſin and wickedneſs; neither is the permiſſion of this, upon ſuch terms as it is permitted, either unworthy Chriſt, or inconvenient to the Body it ſelf.]

No; what, not to have the members *fall off*, without being *cut off*? Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt to have his *hands* caſt themſelves off from his arms into the fire? or to have his *eyes* fling themſelves out of their holes into the water? or his *ears* leap into the dirt? Is this no inconvenience to the body, to have the *parts* jump off from their *hinges*, and the *hinges* caper off from the *parts* which move on them? What, trow you, can be inconvenient to the body, if this be not? Would it be no inconvenience to your body, to have your noſe drop off in a froſty morning? Or what can be more unworthy of Chriſt? Is it for your honour to have your *members* forſake you, and prefer your Diſciple as the more eminent Doctor? Is it not inconvenient to Chriſts body, or unworthy of him, to have his *feet* ſlide away from his body, and leave his body to walk upon its *ſtumps*, or perhaps with better *decorum* upon its *head*? Well, inſtead of a *Reaſon*, you give us a worthy *Reſemblance* of this.

[For as in a Politique or Civil Corporation, it is better that the Governours ſhould permit the Members reſpectively, to go, or be at liberty, that ſo they may follow their buſineſs and occaſions in the world upon the better terms, though by occaſion of this liberty they may behave themſelves in ſundry kinds very unworthily; then it would be to keep them cloſe priſoners, though hereby the ſaid inconveniences might certainly be prevented. In like manner it is much better for the body of Chriſt, and for the reſpective members of it, that he ſhould leave them at liberty, eſpecially upon ſuch terms as he doth, and which have formerly been declared, to obey and ſerve God, and follow the important affairs of their ſouls freely and without any phyſical neceſſitation, though ſome do turn this liberty into wantonnes, and ſo into deſtruction; then it would be to deprive them of this liberty, and to cauſe and conſtrain them to any courſe whatſoever out of neceſſity, though it is true the committing of much ſin and iniquity would be prevented hereby in many.]

Welfare you for this ſimile, which ſo handſomly compares [*our being kept by Chriſt*] as we are wont to carry it, to [being *kept in priſon*;] and *our dear liberty of falling*,] which you ſo earneſtly contend for, to [a *liberty of walking abroad to do our buſineſs the better*;] what [buſineſs] I pray do we do by *ſinning*? yes, *buſineſs* of ſuch high concernment, that we had need be impatient of any *reſtraint* from proſecuting it, conſidering how great a *Prince* we ſerve in it, and how large *wages* we ſhall earn by it. *The God of this world* is much more *bountifull*, I wis, then the *God of heaven*; the *God of this world* nobly offers whole *Kingdoms* for a bare *falling down* and *worſhipping him*, Omnia tibi dabo; *the God of heaven* bids us content our ſelves with leſs matters on *earth*, even hard *food*, and bare *raiment* many a good time; and

now and then he careſſeth us with ſome *whipping cheer* to boot; and is it not then a *hard caſe* to be ſo cloſely hampered, that we ſhould not have liberty to leave his *unprofitable ſervice*, and put our ſelves into the retinue of this more bountifull Lord, as we have the happineſs to be befriended by fair occaſions, ſeconded with the favour of the fleſh and the world, which we may be ſure have an eſpecial intereſt in this great Commander; can he any time commend us to a good imployment under his Honor? Truly, Mr. *Goodwin* highly deſerves of his generation of *Saints*, for ſhewing them by his Doctrine how happy they may be in this [liberty of following their buſineſs and occaſions in the world] in compariſon of what they ſhould be, by being tied up too cloſe in a ſad bondage under Chriſt, according to the dangerous project of our aſſertion concerning their Perſeverance. *Our Doctrine* doth not know what belongs to a *free State*. But upon ſecond thoughts, Good Mr. *Goodwin*, is it not better for a man to be kept in *priſon* in his *houſe*, then to be left to *baniſh himſelf* out of his *Country*? Is it not better to have his *hands manicled* and *tied behind his back*, then to be left to *embrue his knife* in his *blood*? Is it not better for him to be *confined to his chair*, then to be left to *throw* himſelf down the *ſtairs*? This is our caſe: Chriſt, according to our Doctrine, *overrules* us by *his Spirit*, that we may not be *overthrown* by our own *fleſh*. I muſt needs ſay, had the Saints as great an *averſneſs* from any *deadlieſt ſins*, as men *naturally have from killing themſelves*, you might be in a poſſibility of juſtifying this your Simile: but till you make that good, which you will never do, unleſs you get other tools then you uſed in your Ninth Chapter about that work; You muſt give us leave to think, *We are much happier in being ſweetly held in by Chriſt, then in being left looſe to the ſwinge of our own fleſh*.

But [laſtly (ſay you) The diſmembring of the body of Chriſts Apoſtles by the apoſtaſie of *Judas*, was no diſparagement either to Chriſt himſelf, or it.] Right; but [the *Body of Chriſts Apoſtles*] and the *Body of Chriſt*, is not one and the ſame. 1. *The body of Chriſts Apoſtles*, was but a *limb of Chriſts body*. If *the body of Chriſts Apoſtles* were *the body of Chriſt*, either Chriſt hath *more bodies* then *one*, which is a notion fit only for Mr. *Goodwins* ſubtilty to maintain; or elſe Mr. *Goodwin* is not *of the body of Chriſt*, unleſs he be an *Apoſtle*. Now ſure he is neither of the firſt eleven, *Peter*, nor *Andrew*, nor *&c.* and I have as much reaſon to be confident *Paul* and *he* are not *one*; and this Doctrine upon the place ſpeaks not much of *Barnabas* in him: If he belong to [*the Body of the Apoſtles*] it is only in the place of that worthy Saint *Judas*, [whoſe diſmembring could be no diſparagement to the body] as long as it might be recruited with ſo proper a *ſupply*. Hitherto I have conſidered what you ſay concerning the *diſmembring of the body of Chriſt*. 2. Now for the *interchange of members between Chriſt and Satan*,

SECT. 28. [The Scripture (ſay you) preſenteth it as a thing poſſible, yea as frequent and ordinary. *Know you not* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *that your Bodies are the members of Chriſt? ſhall I then take the members of Chriſt, and make them the members of an harlot?* In the Original it is, Ἄρας οὖν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιήσω, *i. e.* taking away the members of Chriſt, ſhall I make them, &c. Meaning that true believers, who only are the Members of Chriſt, diſrelate themſelves to him, ceaſe to be members of his, when, and whiles they live in a courſe of whoredom and adultery, and make themſelves members of another far different relation, *viz.* of thoſe harlots with whom they ſinfully converſe.]

1. I am glad to hear you ſay, that [only true believers are members of Chriſt;] for therefore *believers of the truth*, if they be not *true believers*, may apoſtatize at any time, and the *body of Chriſt* be not *diſmembred* at all by their apoſtatizing.

2. I grant you, that [the members of Chriſt, when they fall into ſuch ſins, diſrelate themſelves to him,] as to *their part*, they carry not themſelves anſwerably to ſo *honorable a relation*; but it follows not they *diſrelate themſelves*, ſo as to *take off his care of them*, yea it follows *they do not*; for they *return many of them to repentance*; and that I think is wrought in them by his *care*.

3. In reſpect of the *election of God*, men are *members of Chriſt*, who in reſpect of their *own demeanour*, are *members of the Devil*. It is *this union* that we intend, in reſpect

ſpe ctof *Gods decree*, not in regard of *mens demeanor*, and muchleſs their *deſert*, though *elect men* carry themſelves *before their calling*, ſo as to *merit* the loweſt place in *Hell*; that hinders not, but God having *written their names in heaven* from *eternity*, will call them in *due time* out of that eſtate of *damnation*: they were *choſen* from *everlaſting*, and ſo *given to Chriſt*, though they be *called in time*, *his members*, in regard of his *election* while *members of the Devil* in regard of their *own converſation*, and as their carrying themſelves as *members of the Devil*, in reſpect of their conſtant courſe of converſation *before their calling*, hinders not but that they are ſtill members of Chriſt in regard of *Gods election*; ſo neither doth their carrying themſelves now and then after the ſame mode, *after their calling*, break off this their *relation to Chriſt*, in regard of Gods *eternal election*. It is a membership upon *this account*, that we chiefly contend for; further, a *departing* themſelves as *members of the Devil* in *one act*, doth not hinder but they may be, as I may ſay *habitually* the *members* of *Chriſt*. A *member* of *Chriſt* may ſo *diſcolour* it ſelf, that it may look like a *member of Satan*, yet not make it ſelf ſuch, but that upon a *waſhing*, it may appear again to be a *member* of *Chriſt*, and was ſo *before*, though it did not *appear*.

Onward, *Paul* doth not ſay, that he that commits fornication is preſently a *member of Satan*: He ſaith indeed, he is *one body with a harlot*. But caſt this into a Syllogiſm. *A harlot is one body with Satan*; *he that is joyned to a harlot, is one body with a harlot*; ergo, *he is one body with Satan*. I am much miſtaken, or the young Sophiſters will ſay, This ſyllogiſm is fraught with more terms then any Syllogiſm of the greateſt burther from *Barbara* to *Feriſon*, can carry. I pray obſerve the Cargaſon of it better in this form. Mr. ſuch a one is a member of Mr. *Goodwins* Church; Mr. ſuch a one's little toe is a member of Mr. ſuch a one: *Ergo* Mr. ſuch a one's little toe is a member of Mr. *Goodwins* Church; and by conſequence ſhall have a vote the next time Mr. *Goodwins* Church ſits in judgment upon Mr. *Kendals* Book: Or if this ſhould ſeem not to be altogether of the ſame mood and figure, I pray take this in the room of it; Miſtriſs ſuch a one is one body with Mr. *Goodwin*, *i. e.* his Church. He that is joyned to Ms. ſuch a one, is one body with Ms. ſuch a one. *Ergo* he that is joyned to Ms. ſuch a one, is one body with Mr. *Goodwin*: not ſo ſtreight, elſe no *wife* can be of Mr. *Goodwins* Church, but her *husband* muſt be ſo too, which is not true; witneſs her good Gentlewoman who told me Mr. *Goodwin* preached the Goſpel, as never any other man did ſince the Apoſtles time; yet her worthy husband was only of Mr. *Goodwins Auditory*, but not of his *Congregation*. Not one body with him.

Well but [*Calvin* himſelf commenting upon the next words, *Know ye not*, &c. expreſly affirms, *That he that couples himſelf with an harlot, thereby becomes one body with her*; *and therefore puls away a member from the body of Chriſt*] Be it ſo, *he* in this caſe *puls away a member from the body of Chriſt*; it follows not *the member is pulled away*: *He puls it away* as to *his part*, and yet the *member is not pulled away preſently*, it may thank Chriſt, who *holds it faſt*, even when *the man puls it away*: Somewhat like as *he that looks on a woman to luſt after her, commits adultery with her* on *his part*, yet is not the *woman committed adultery with*, or *adulterated* on *her part*. This expreſſion of *pulling away a member from the body of Chriſt*, ſhews the *demerit of the act*, not the *event* of it; the *defect* of it, which is alwaies that *the member ſhould be pulled away from Chriſt*, not the *effect of it*, which is not ſo *alwaies*; the more admirable is the mercy of God.

[*Ambroſe* and *Muſculus* his words ſound no leſs;] nor do they *ſignifie more* then *Calvins*. I am in haſte to examin how you ſhut up all with this weighty concluſion: [If it be no diſhonour unto Chriſt, to admit and take in ſuch who have been the foulleſt and moſt deformed members of the Devill, upon their repentance, for members of his body, which is nothing but what he doth daily, why ſhould it be any diſparagement unto him, to reject ſuch from being members of this his body, who by their wicked and abominable waies, render themſelves altogether unworthy the great dignitie of ſuch a relation?] The caſe is as different as could well be expected. for,

1. It

1. It is, I confeſs, [no diſhonour to Chriſt to reject ſuch, who by their wicked and abominable waies, render themſelves altogether unworthy the dignity of ſuch a relation:] and accordingly if he ſhould reject me, or the beſt of my brethren, that concur with me, in aſſerting the Doctrine which I am now endeavouring to defend, we ſhall have no cauſe to ſay he deals in a way *diſhonourable to him*, the beſt of our waies have ſo much in them, which God may look upon *as wicked and abominable*: we cannot *look him in the face*, much leſs *caſt out* any thing that tends to his *diſhonour*; how ſeverely ſoever he ſhould proceed againſt us, ſtill our *ſufferings* will be ſhort of our *ſins*. And I ſuppoſe Mr. *Goodwin* will not preſume to juſtifie *himſelf*, or any of *his members* ſo far, as not to confeſs, Chriſt might without diſhonour reject them, be their waies never ſo *fair* and *ſtraight*. But

2. Albeit it would be no diſhonour to Chriſt to deal thus with us, conſidering the *merit* of our *beſt waies*, all which have in them too much that is *wicked and abominable*; yet conſidering his *engagement* to procure the *pardon* of our ſins, be they never ſo *abominable*, whiles we our ſelves *abhor* and *abominate* both *them* and our *ſelves* for them; it would be *diſhonourable* to him, in reſpect of his *own promiſe*.

3. It would be more diſhonourable to him to let us run into ſo *wicked* and *abominable* waies, as that they ſhould *exceed his righteouſneſs*, and the *ſatisfaction* he hath made for us.

And 4. It would be more *diſhonourable* to him, *not to keep us in waies of holyneſs* for the *main*, it being his *office* to *preſerve us*, and not to *loſe any of thoſe which the Father hath given him*, *John* 6.

5. It would be as *diſhonourable* to him not to *keep* us in his waies, having engaged himſelf to do it, as it was *honourable* to him to *bring* us into his waies, when we were *ſet upon waies wicked and abominable*. Can you think it would be Chriſts *honour* to *bring us out of abominable waies*, if he ſhould leave us to *return to them?* How would it appear *we brought not our ſelves to good*, if we were *left* to *return again to evil?* The truth is, *you* make as if Chriſt admitted and took us in, meerly upon *our repentance*. *We* ſay, *he wrought our repentance, that he might take us in*; that we had the *firſt grace* whereby we were *enabled to repent*, *freely from him*, that we had the *comforts after grace*; that the *worſe we were*, the *more* was *his honour* to *bring us to good*; would it make for his honour, to *leave us being made good in ſome meaſure, to return to all manner of evil*; eſpecially he having *obliged himſelf by his promiſe*, to *keep us from it?*

SECT. 29. You come to anſwer to that part of the Argument we alleadged againſt you; the *inconvenience of making regeneration iterable*, and tell us gravely, [There is no inconvenience, nothing unworthy of God, or of Chriſt in it; and for men, it is of a moſt happy and bleſſed accommodation unto them.]

1. That there is not any thing unworthy of God or of Chriſt in *it ſelf*, we yield: For ſure it is no unworthy thing to *give ſpiritual life toties, quoties*. But by your leave, conſidering the promiſe of God in Chriſt, that he will ever keep thoſe to whom he hath once given ſpiritual life, from *loſing* it; it is diſhonourable to him to leave them to *loſe* it, which they *muſt doe*, ere they be in a capacity of having *it given them again*. And 2. Thus albeit an *iteration of Regeneration*, *ſound nothing directly*, which is unworthy of God; yet it *ſuppoſeth* ſomewhat that is unworthy of him, the *giving life a ſecond time*, is *not*, but the *leaving his children* to *loſe life given them*, he having ingaged himſelf to preſerve it, *is unworthy of God*, and *unworthy of Chriſt too*; for he having paſſed the ſame *promiſe*, is alike engaged in point of *honour*. And 3. albeit [it be of an happy and bleſſed accommodation unto men to have life given them a ſecond time,] in caſe it were loſt; yet I hope the *giving of it a ſecond time*, *ſuppoſeth that* which is not of ſo much *comfort*, a *loſs of their ſpiritual life*: Whereas you learnedly infer a poſſibility of a ſecond Regeneration from [the Apoſtles ſpeaking of an impoſſibility of renewing ſome by repentance.] I refer the Reader to Chap. 11. Sect. where he ſhall find that conſequence ſufficiently examined.

But when you add, [If men may die twice ſpiritually, as *Jude* ſpeaks of ſome that

that were twice dead, *v.* 12. Why may they not *live twice*, or *twice* receive the grace oppoſite hereunto?] I anſwer, That if they did *dye twice properly*, they muſt needs have had a *ſecond life* properly given them, before they were in a *capacity* of *dying the ſecond time*. But the Apoſtle ſpeaks not ſo; he ſpeaks not of men *twice dead*, otherwiſe then to ſhew they were *ſtark dead*; and comparing them to *trees twice dead*, is but as we ſay, *He is as dead as a door-nail*, that is, *ſtark dead*; though in this *laſt* there be a viſible Catachreſis: A *door-nail* having *never been alive*, cannot be ſaid *to be dead*; but when we ſay, *A man is as dead as a door-nail*, our meaning is, as much *paſt recovering of life*, as a *door-nail is uncapable of having it*. And when [*Jude* compares theſe men to trees twice dead] he adds, *plucked up by the roots*; to ſignifie *their incapacity of being renewed*, ſomewhat the more emphatically. But he intends not, that they *had been renewed*, and *had dyed again* after that *renewing*: which yet it is poſſible may befall a tree, *Iob* 14.8,9.

You proceed. [1. For the non-unworthineſs of it on Gods part. As it is agreeable to the righteouſneſs and holineſs of God, to denounce the ſentence of excluſion from his Kingdom againſt men, whoever they be, or have been, when they turn Adulterers, Fornicators, Idolaters, &c. yea and to execute this ſentence accordingly, in caſe they return not from thoſe ſins by repentance before they die; and ſo to leave them no footing or foundation for their faith, I mean, to believe, or to expect ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt, but only upon their repentance: So it is no leſs agreeable to the mercy, patience, and goodneſs of God, to promiſe unto backſliding ſinners a re-enjoyment of his favour and love which is in Chriſt Jeſus, upon condition of their renewing again by repentance, and to exhibite unto them accordingly the full fruits thereof in the ſalvation of their ſouls, if they perſevere in a courſe of repentance unto the end.] What doth this make for a poſſibility of a *ſecond Regeneration*, as not unworthy of God? It is one thing to ſpeak of his giving *glory* upon *repentance perſevered* in; another, to ſpeak of his *giving* firſt *grace*, a *ſecond time*, that they *may repent*, after they *have totally fallen*.

2. For the inconvenience of it on mens part. [How ſad and deplorable above meaſure would the condition of many thouſands of Saints be, in caſe there were no reiteration of Regeneration; I mean of all ſuch as at any time fall into ſuch wayes, and practiſes of ſin, which according as we have lately heard from the Scriptures, exclude from the Kingdom of God.] Why will not *a preſervation of their former life*, though in a *ſwoun*, in the midſt of thoſe *falls*, be as much for their *comfort*, as a *giving a new* by a *ſecond Regeneration*? We are bold to ſay, *Every ſin* in regard of its *demerit* excludes from the Kingdom; *No ſin* to thoſe that have been regenerate, in regard of the *event*, for that God will give them *repentance*; and why is it more [*ſad* and *deplorable*] to have the *former life not loſt*, then not *to have a new beſtowed* by your ſecond Regeneration?

Well, but [Doubtleſs there is no more inconvenience for the ſame perſon to be twice regenerate, then it was, or would have been under the Law, for the ſame man to have taken Sanctuary the ſecond time, in caſe he had the ſecond time miſcarried, in ſlaying a man at unawares.]

Nay, ſay rather, no more then there is for a *Child* to take *Sanctuary* a *ſecond time* in his *Mothers womb*? Is this *ſecond taking Sanctuary* a fit reſemblance of *Regeneration*? It is, I grant, of a ſecond *flying to God by faith and repentance for pardon*; but it no way anſwers *Regeneration*: For though the *Sanctuary* may be ſaid to *give life a ſecond time*; yet it gives not ſuch life as ſaves. The Manſlayers life was not loſt, though it *were* forfeited; and it *was* forfeited only with a Proviſo that *he fled not to the Sanctuary*. Nay, it was not forfeited without flying to the Sanctuary, but with this Proviſo, *that the Kinſman of the party ſlain ſhould purſue him*, and be both too *ſwift*, and too *ſtrong* for him. The man, good Sir, was *not dead in law* by his *fact*; there was to be a concurrence of theſe *ſeveral circumſtances* beſides. And make the moſt of it, here is but a *preſerving of life from a ſecond danger of death*, not a *raiſing of man from death* to the benefit of a *ſecond life*. But now we are come *ad Triarios*, no leſs then an Argument drawn by the greateſt ſubtilty that Logick is miſtreſs of,

from

from [the Grammatical and proper ſignification of the word *Regeneration.* Thus Regeneration imports a reiteration, or repetition of ſome generation or other: but it cannot import a repetition of the *natural generation*; therefore it muſt import a repetition of a *ſpiritual generation.*] You know [the Road-opinion is,] That it ſignifies only the *ſpiritual generation*, with a kind of reference unto, or reflexion upon the *natural.* But againſt this you diſpute thus, upon a ground which is the common ſenſe of Divines:

[That the two generations mentioned, the natural and the ſpiritual, are *membra dividentia*, and contradiſtinguiſhed the one unto the other. Now you ſuppoſe there can hardly be any inſtance giuen, where the introducing of one contrary form or quality into the ſubject, is termed a reiteration or repetition of the other. *Calefaction* is never termed a repetition of *frigefaction*; nor is *albifaction* called a repetition of *nigrifaction*; nor when a regenerate or mortified man dies his *natural* death, is he ſaid to reiterate or repeat his *ſpiritual* death.]

Nor, on my conſcience, is any man when he is *regenerate* ſaid to repeat his *natural* birth, albeit he be ſaid to be *born again*: This being *born again* ſignifies not a *repetition* of his *firſt birth*, but the *addition* of a *ſecond* birth *reſembling* the *firſt* in ſundry reſpects. Now let the [*firſt birth* and the *ſecond* be contradiſtinguiſhed one to the other] they are contradiſtinguiſhed not as *oppoſita*, but *diverſa*; or if they were *oppoſita*, muſt they needs be *adverſa* or *contraria?* Your [Grammatical notion] would have had a little better ſeaſoning of Logick: here is not ſuch an *oppoſition*, as there is between two [*contrary forms* or *qualities.*] The *corruption* of *nature*, may it pleaſe you, not the *beginning of life*, is that whereunto Regeneration is *oppoſed* as *contrary*; it is *likened* only to the *beginning of life.* Now two things which are *like* one another, are *oppoſita*, even as *ſimilia*: *Similitude* being a *relation*, which when we were at the Schools we were wont to call *mutua*; and *relata*, we there learned, made *one ſpecies of oppoſita.* I am almoſt freezed to think of this *cold oppoſition* you make againſt us, in your inſtance of *Calefaction* and *Frigefaction*, *Albifaction* and *Nigrifaction*; A rare Scholaſtical *inſtance* at *Coleman-ſtreet*, but ſuch as will loſe *its colour* as it is brought before any Venerable Aſſembly of young Sophiſters, and be as *blue* as the Aldermen of *Cambridge*, when

The dull Poet put them all in ſtarch,
Only to make them rime to th' firſt of March.

Well, I am ready to attend you in your advance out of [the Road-Doctrine.] [Therefore I rather conceive, that *Regeneration* which the Scripture makes appropriable only to perſons living to years of diſcretion, who generally in the dayes of their youth degenerate from the innocence of their childhood and younger years, and corrupt themſelves with the principles and ways of the world, relates not unto the natural generation as ſuch, I mean as natural, but unto the ſpiritual eſtate and condition of men in reſpect of their *natural generation* and *birth*; in, and upon which, they are, if not ſimply and abſolutely, yet comparatively innocent, harmleſs, free from pride, malice, &c. and in reſpect of theſe qualifications, in grace and favour with God, upon the account of the death and ſufferings of Chriſt for them.]

1. Here is a pretty adventure of yours, in ſaying, [The Scripture makes Regeneration appropriable only to perſons living to the years of diſcretion.] 1. I deſire to know whether the Scripture appropriate *the Kingdom of heaven* only to thoſe [which live to the years of diſcretion?] I am ſure it ſaith, *Except a man be born again, he ſhall not enter into it.* Doth a *man* there ſignifie a *man* come [to the years of diſcretion?] Find me that in any *Lexicon*; if it ſignifie a *humane creature*, then the ſenſe is, *No humane creature ſhall enter into the Kingdom of heaven, except he be born again.* And then of courſe you muſt ſay, either that perſons who are not come to years of diſcretion enter not into the Kingdom of heaven; or that *Children*, if they enter into that Kingdom before they come to years of diſcretion, are not *humane creatures* before *they come to years of diſcretion.* What do you think of men *paſt the*

years

years of discretion; whether there be more hope of them, or whether they cease to be humane creatures? 2. I observe here is a going out of [the Common road,] many a fair mile, more then you may be thought to have intended. [Many of the Ancients held Baptism a sign of Regeneration.] Say they all looked on is at a necessary instrument of Regeneration, necessary to the salvation of Infants *necessitate medii*; and too many great Doctors at this day are of the same mind. Yet saith your Magistership, [Scripture appropriates Regeneration only to persons come to years of discretion.] If so, then not only is Baptism of Infants not necessary *necessitate medii*, which *they* hold, but also not necessary *necessitate præcepti*. Yet I conceive you hold the contrary: Nay, it is *our duty not to administer Baptism* the Sign of Regeneration, to *Infants*; what should they have the *sign*, who are not capable of the *thing signified*? And thus your affirming [Regeneration to be appropriated only to persons which are come to years of discretion] lays a greater ground for the *denial* of the Baptism of Infants, then any you have laid whereon to *build* it.

2. What is this, that [*Generally* in the years of their Youth persons degenerate from the innocence of their Childhood?] I had thought they had done so *universally*. But it is true, some such men as *you*, that never injured man, woman, or child, in deed or word, have not so *degenerated* in this kind, but are as *innocent* as the *Child new born*, and so need not be *regenerate*, or *born anew*. What should this waste be made of the *Graces of the Spirit*? Your *innocence* will save much of this cost: A few *innocent Blasphemies* are the worst can be charged on your years of *discretion*; No need of *that* part of *Regeneration* that looks towards the *second Table*, which concerns *duties to man*.

3. What admirable conceit is this of [mens spiritual estate and condition, in respect of their natural generation and birth?] This *spiritual estate* we were wont to call *carnal*; *That which is born of the flesh, is flesh*. We humbly conceived *Regeneration* had been a *generation* to a *contrary estate*, not a *reducing men to this*: A *spiritual estate*, forsooth, which would *keep men from heaven to eternity*.

4. You play with the same hand still, as if you were never to be espied. In and upon which, (marrie, the spiritual estate and condition in respect of mens natural generation and birth) [they are, if not simply and absolutely, yet comparatively innocent, harmless, free from pride, malice, &c. and in respect of these qualifications, in grace and favour with God, upon the account of the death and sufferings of Christ for them.]

I think, 1. The poor *Lambs* and *Chicken* are freer from *pride* and *malice* then any *Infants* whatsoever; will such a freedom put them into the *grace* and *favour* of God? No, belike *Christ died not for them*; and upon that account of Christs death it is, that *Children in respect of these qualifications* are in the grace and favour of God. But then, 2. What needed *Christ die for Infants*? Sin of *their own* they had *none*; and could God in justice have condemned them, not being guilty of any sin of their *own*? admit Christ had saved his blood, an unnecessary expence in behalf of those who had *no sin of their own*.

Why, but you say no more then what [our Saviour himself implieth in that passage of his with the Disciples. *Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.* Iav ut στραφητε, *Except ye be turned back*, (as *Calvin*) *i.e.* unless you recover and reinstate your selves in that estate, or interest in the love and favour of God, (which you are in danger of losing by your ambition) by returning to such an humility, innocency, and simplicity, wherein whiles you were Children you were accepted with him.] Leave out that clause, [wherein you were accepted with him;] much good may all the rest do you. We grant, Christ minds them of a necessity of *returning back to that estate*: but that estate was but free from those sins in *act*, not in *disposition*. But [unless we shall suppose that Children are in an estate of grace and favour with God, we shall make him say in effect, that unless they be like unto those who are in an estate of condemnation, they shall never be saved.]

And why may we not make him (as you say) speak thus, with this caution; *Unless they be like those who shall be condemned*, viz. in such things wherein they are to be *commended*, albeit they shall be *condemned*, and that most justly, for *others*. I wonder why you do not say, God speaks in effect as if we were not Christians, unless we be like beasts and birds, when he requires of us we be like *Lambs* and *Doves*? And then learnedly add; *That we shall not come to heaven, unless we carry our selves like those who shall return meerly to the dust*: that we shall not be as the blessed *Angels*, unless we be as the *Serpents* which were *cursed*; we *shall not*, unless we be like them in *curiousness*, it follows not we are to be like them in *venemousness*. Shortly, when our Saviour saith, *Except ye become as Children*, he means it not in *every thing*, I trust, but in that *simplicity* or *harmlesness*; which albeit it were *not such* as to put them into the *favour of God*, yet was *such* as *without which* none could ever expect the *favour of God*. Nor do we need, as your old friend *Musculus* well observes, to attribute any peculiar harmlesness to *this particular Infant*; but it sufficeth to take it in this sense, that there is *no man of years*, but ere he be in a capacity of *coming into the kingdom of heaven*, he is to retreat from all that *pride, ambition, affectation* of great things, which he hath aspired unto all along even since his very *childhood*.

You are here conscious to your self, that you have said that which seems to imply that Children are born without original sin; and therefore you gravely tell us, [that there is nothing said by you to this purpose,] but never vouchsafe to answer any objection upon this last account. I beseech you think of this: If original sin bring children under the wrath of God, then all children not under his wrath are without original sin: But no children in their first birth are under the wrath of God, say you, *Ergo*. The *Minor* I make good thus, upon this last account of yours: They who are in grace and favour with God, are not under his wrath; but all children, say you, as children, are in grace and favour with God, *Ergo*. Yea, but you have an answer at hand,

[That that sin which is in children, is taken away by the death of Christ; so that they are generally, whiles children, in the favour of God through Christ, notwithstanding that sin which is in them.]

I reply, 1. If that sin original be in all children, then it is *not taken away from them*: but you say it *is in them*. 2. If that sin be taken away from all children, then it was taken away from them either *before* they were conceived, or *after*, or in the *first* moment of their conception. If *before* they were conceived, then they had *sin before* they were conceived, *to be taken away*: if *after*, then either sin was *in them before* it was taken away, or *not*; if *not* in them, it could not be *taken away*; if it *were in them*, then so long were they not *in grace and favour with God*, while their sin was *in them* and not *taken away*: If *it were taken away in the first moment* of their conception, then I ask whether in that moment it were *in them*, or *not*? If *it were in them*, it was *not taken away*; if it *were not in them*, then when was *it in them*? If in the moment *before*, then they had sin *before* they were conceived. Belike it was in the moment *after it was taken away*. Come, be ingenious, and according to your wonted openness speak out, and tell us plainly, No children are troubled with the supposed disease of Original sin; nor are ther any such things as *Children of wrath* to be found any where but among *persons come to years of discretion*. As for *harmless Children*, they, if ever they had any tang of Original sin, it was *taken from them* in the *first moment* it *seized on them*.

[Nor is this any thing more then *Musculus* himself upon the place clearly avoucheth of all Children without exception, that have been baptized.] Like enough; and some others as well as *Musculus* are ready to say as much: But what is this of [Children baptized] to *Children as Children*; and the [*spiritual estate* and condition of men in respect of their *natural generation and birth*, in which they are in grace and favour with God upon the account of Christs death and sufferings?] We are content to allow you all that you add in your next Section; for we are not such *children* as to lay too much weight upon that Text, [*Ye have not many fathers*,] to prove the non-repetition of Regeneration. But we are bold to say, if there might

be

be a *second Regeneration*, they might have *many fathers in Christ*, and for ought appears more then *one Baptisme*; which yet is contrary to the practise of the Church, and as some have thought, to that passage of the Apostle, *Ephes.* 4.5. *One Lord, one faith, one baptisme.*

You have a dash or two at the *Book of life*; and a certain [inconsiderable Objection which you have heard some make against your Doctrine, That it supposeth a blotting and blurring, a putting in and putting out of Names in that Book.] Which some poor Clerks think a high disparagement to it; but you more learnedly demonstrate [to be so far from being a dishonour to it] that belike it is an ornament. Else we must think [*Moses* would not have prayed God to *blot him out of the Book which he had written*, in case he would not forgive the sin of the people.] The blotting out of this same *Moses* his name, would (as you seem to judge) have made the Book the *fairer* and more *vendible*; and [Questionless *Moses*, who was so jealous of Gods honour, would not so sadly have importuned God to *blot out his name*, if this blotting out of his name had cast a slur on Gods book.] SECT. 31.

But, 1. What if *Moses* spake this in a meer *extasie of zeal*, which may be allowed to *speak a little without book?* 2. What if *Moses*, in confidence that God could not with honour to his own faithfulness blot out his name, pray God to blot it out, if he will not forgive the peoples sin? and so said upon the matter thus: *Lord, if thou canst not in honour* blot out *my single name*, how canst thou blot out the name of this *great people*, thy dear *Israel?* Thou must either blot out *their names*, or *their sins*: *This* will be for the glory of thy *mercy*; *that* cannot stand with the honour of thy *truth*; it will not, I am assured, permit thee to blot out *mine own* poor *name*, and can it suffer *thy Peoples names* to be *all blotted out?* This speech of *Moses* to *God*, is but as that of God's *to his people*, Mal. 1.8. *Give it now unto thy Governour*: q. d. Thou wilt not presume to give it to thy Governour. So, *blot out my name*, is *q. d.* Thou wilt not be so harsh, as to blot out *my name*; and wilt thou not then be so gracious, as to strike out the *sin of thy people?* So then *Moses* his prayer rather proves that the *blotting out of his name* was *impossible*, then that it would have been *no blemish to Gods book*.

Yea, but whatever *Moses* his prayer do, [Gods answer to it evinceth that such a blotting is frequent, and no defacing of his Book: *Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book*, Exod. 32. 32.] These words would have been beholding to some *Construction*, before they had been used thus *Argument-wise*. Surely 1. It is not true in the *strictness of speech*, that *God will blot out whosoever hath sinned against him*. Were it true, there were *never a name left in Gods book*: *All have sinned against him*, and consequently according to the genius of these words should be *all blotted out of his book*. 2. Neither is it clear, that *Whosoever of these Israelites sinned* against God, had their *names blotted out of his book*: Many of them, it is probable, had not only their *names in his book*, but *his seal on their foreheads*. Therefore 3. this threat is to be supposed to carry in it a *secret exception*, *unless* they *repent*; which as many as had their *names written in Gods book*, we may reasonably conclude, *did*, and accordingly *prevented* the *execution* of this *threat*.

Yea, but whatever the e Texts do, the next clears the point fully. [God promiseth *him that overcomes, that he will not blot his name out of the book of life*, Rev. 3.5, which clearly supposeth that there were, or at least might be some, whose names he would blot out of this book; otherwise it would be no matter of honour, or specialty of priviledge, which he promiseth herein.] Right: but the question is, what is meant 1. by this *Book*; 2. by *blotting out of it*. Upon examination of *these points*, I hope it will appear, that we may yield a *blotting of names out of Gods book*, without any danger to *our Doctrine* of the *Perseverance of the Elect*, and yet hold withall that *your Doctrine* of the *total and final Apostasie of the Saints*, infers *such a blotting*, as would be most *dishonourable* to Gods *book*.

1. Then, *What is Gods book of life?* [Nothing else (say *you*) but Gods general purpose or decree concerning persons to be saved, not by their names, but their capacities or qualifications.] 1. I beseech you, to what doth this [*not by their names*] refer?

refer? To [*Persons to be saved,*] or to *Gods general purpose, or decree concerning them?* If to those words [*persons to be saved,*] then is it either to [*persons*] or to [*to be saved:*] If to [*to be saved*] I know no man dreams of any persons *being saved* either by their *names*, or their *capacities* and *qualifications*. We say indeed, *He that hath a bad name, is half hanged*: But albeit a *bad name* may help to advance a man to the *gallows*, I do not think you will shew us in haste how any *name*, be it never so *good*, besides that of *Jesus*, can save a man from *hell*, and raise him to *heaven*. If to [*persons*] then it is as much, as if the words related [to Gods *general purpose or decree concerning persons to be saved, not by their names.*] But what is this, [Gods decree concerning persons, not by their names, but their capacities?] What are their [names, or capacities] considerable here? The question is, whether Gods decrees concern not particular persons so far, as to extend to their salvation; and to this end to extend so far, as to *put* them into such an estate as might give them a capacity of salvation, and to *preserve* them in that *capacity* to salvation? which we affirm: Or whether he only decree in generall, that whosoever *puts himself* into such a qualification, forsooth, shall be saved, and none other? Now this is that which hath been blown up over and over already.

At present I shall add only this; That according to your *exposition*, 1. *God writes no mans name in his book*, but leaves a *blank* for *every man* to *write his own name* as he shall think good, and *blot it out* again when he pleaseth. 2. But sure *he blots no mans name out*; for *he* puts not men into the qualification of *damnation*, *they* put themselves into *it*. 3. That *there are no names written in Gods book*, [no particular men designed to salvation] and consequently *none blotted out*; for there being none *designed particularly to salvation*, there can be *no reversing of such a design*. Now whereas you conclude, [So that if it be not unseemly for God to destroy backsliding sinners, who remain hardned and impenitent to the end, neither is it unseemly for him to blot the names of men, upon the occasion specified, out of his book of life.] It is granted, in a *right sense*. But after *that*, I will now enquire.

The *Book*, upon the *first opening of it*, shews it self to be above all [Carnality of notion.] No man on earth will be apt to believe there are any such *books* as are made of *paper* and *ink*, or the like materials, in *Heaven*, no nor in *hell* neither; but that *books* and *writing* also are to be understood not as *proper*, but *tropical*. And thus are there several books.

1. *David* tells us of a *book* of *God's*, wherein *all his members were written*, Ps. 139. and thus I take it, *all men* that ever were born, had both their *names*, and all their *parts*, yea their very *hairs* written in Gods book of life from eternity; that is, he decreed from eternity to give them *life*, and every *part*, and *hair* that they have, all which he is said to *number*. Yea, howbeit *you* have had the luck to find out [some persons both of men and women] (and questionless many more ignoble animals) [whose parents were not determined to their generation by any decree of Heaven] yet *we* humbly conceive that God, whose providence extends its care to the *death of sparrows*, did as much order the *birth* of *all the creatures* which are, have been, or shall be in *rerum natura*. That this *book of life* hath the *names* not only of *all men*, but *all living creatures in it*; and when those creatures *dye*, we say not, *their names are blotted out of that book*, but that they *dye according as was written in the same book from eternity*, and that their *Exits* were set down as well as their *Intrats*.

2. *Malachy*, Chap. 3. v. 16. tels us of *a Book of Remembrance written before God*, for *them that feared the Lord*, *and that thought upon his name*. This seems to be said in reference to the practice of *Princes*, who keep *private Lists of the names* of men whom they intend to *prefer*: And thus I remember well, the Lord Keeper was wont to have a little *Book*, wherein he entred the *names* of men commended to him to be *benificed* or *dignified* by him, (as a certain sucking Doctorell said) according to the quality of their degrees, or the *degree* of their *qualities*. Now *this Book* is such, as hath several *Columns* in it, as I may say, the *good works* of such as fear God, registred on *one side*, and the *evil* on the *other*, and accordingly signifies the *purpose of God to distribute rewards and corrections* in this world, proportionably

onably, for the most part. Neither is here any *blotting out of names or works*, none *loseth his reward*, but all the *deductions*, that *they receive not a full reward*, 2 John v. 8. are entred as it were over against their *good works*. God never *blotted out any mans name* whom he *entred in this book*, albeit it be true he have many times set a *cross* on the *names* of his *best servants*, and defaulked somewhat of the *reward*, which otherwise according to the ordinary course of his dispensations they might have expected.

3. The *third Book* is, if I may so speak, such, as wherein *mens names are written in heaven*, *Luke*. 10. Now for this *writing in heaven*, it signifies not that they are written in heaven in the Astrological sense, as somebody wrote at large of *reading the stars*, which he would bear us in hand are as so many Hebrew Characters. But 1. this, that *God whose throne is in heaven*, is he who writes this *Book*: 2. That *those whose names* are written in *this book*, are *Cœlo adscripti*, *written to heaven*, or a *place there*. Now *heaven* signifies either the *Church militant*, *Heaven upon Earth*, the *Kingdome of heaven*, that is a Corporation of men, who are *Cœli cunctatores*, or the *Church triumphant*, *heaven above*. *Many* whose *names are written in heaven*, in the *first* sense, are *not written in heaven* in the *last*. None that are *written in heaven in the best sense* are *blotted out*, *nor can be*; *many* that are written in the *first* are. Shortly then, when men are first admitted into the *Church on earth*, *we* look upon them as *of the kingdom of heaven*; and not knowing their *hearts*, judg of them in charity, as true *Citizens of heaven*; when they apostatize, we say *their names are blotted out*; when they return, *written in again*. Such *blotting out*, and *putting in again*, we allow, is no defacing of this Book; as which relates to *mens demeanour as visible to us*. But as for those who are *designed by God* to a place *in heaven above*; we affirm *no blotting* to be incident to *their names*; for God designed them to heaven, not *for their demeanour* on *earth*, whether we refer those words *for their demeanour*, to *heaven*, or to *designe*; he designed them not *for their demeanour*, for that were to make *his designation* dependent upon *their demeanour*; he designed them not *to heaven for their demeanours*; for albeit he designed *heaven* to *them* as a *reward* of their *demeanour*, yet not as a *debt*: it is to be given *according* to their works, not *for* them. Now then many whom *we* look upon as *written in*, *and blotted out of heaven*, were *never written in by God*, and consequently *never blotted out by him*; only many whom we had *written in heaven*, are *blotted out* at present when they apostatize; and many who are *not blotted out* at present, as not apostatizing, yet shall be *blotted out at last*, when God shal shew that albeit they *professed the truth*, they were never *true believers*. Thus I acknowledg, [that of *Cameron*, *Deleri à libro vitæ, nihil aliud est quam damnari.*] And so shal many a man be at the last day, whom we had cause enough to hope, should be saved. But mark, you Reverend Sir, if [*deleri à libro vitæ* be nothing else but *damnari*,] then *no man was ever blotted out, and written in again*, (which you affirm to be done without defacing the book of life) unless some man *after he was damned*, were *delivered* from *the wrath* already *come*. To conclude, As *the Book of life* signifies *Gods decree to save men*, no man was ever blotted that was once written in it, else God changed his Decree; as it signifies the *Register*, as I may say, of men whom we are to look upon in charity, as *decreed by God to be saved*, so many are *blotted out*, and *written in again*; but *this* relates only to *our judgment*, not *Gods Councels*, which we justly maintain, to be *uncapable of alteration*. And thus I have done, and shall *blot* no more paper about this *blotting*.

You bring us your sixth Argument, which you stile [demonstrative of your Assertion,] and lay about it thus. SECT. 32. *Arg.* 6.

[That Doctrine which is according to Godliness, *i.e.* whose natural and proper tendencie is to promote Godliness in the hearts and lives of men, is Evangelical, and of unquestionable comportance with the truth: Such is the Doctrine which reacheth a possibility of the Saints declining both totally and finally, *Ergo.*]

1. *Concedo totum.* We grant as *much* as to the Saints *themselves*, and *more*.

2. I have already shewed at large, what kind of *godliness* your *Doctrine* advanceth, in my first Part, in answer to your 6. *Arg. Chap.* 18. And more particularly, what strain the Godliness is of, which *this part of your Doctrine* promoteth, in my Answer

to

to the first Chapter of this your worthy Digression, and in several other parts of this present Discourse. In which respect I might ease my self of making a new Reply to this old Reason of yours, now new dressed; and if I had a mind to save my pains, probably I might procure as judicious an Assembly as your learned Church, to vote this Argument unworthy to be called so often to an account. Whose stomach can bear these reboil'd Coleworts?

O dura Messorum ilia!

Yet that you may not complain of being slighted, I shall perswade my self, and pray the Reader, to have patience while I call your Argument to a reckoning. Let your Major pass upon its Parol; the Minor must be content to submit to an *Examination*, as confidently as it demands of us.

[What Doctrine can be more proper or powerfull to promote godliness in the hearts and lives of men, then that, which on the one hand promiseth a Crown of blessedness and eternal glory to those that live godlily, without declining; and on the other hand, threatneth the vengeance of eternal fire, against those that shall turn aside to prophaneness, and not return by repentance?]

I dare say, there is no Doctrine in the Christian, yea or the Mahometan world, that doth not say as *much*, except only that of your good friends, the *Saints-Rantors* of your *Hagiomastix* his Canonizing. Else there is none but promiseth, and threatneth, according to the tenor of your Demand, glory to non-decliners, vengeance eternal to decliners from godliness. But the question is, *What is godliness?* and surely *the godliness* which your Doctrine advanceth, is not altogether of the right stamp; and if *the godliness* be not *right*, let your Doctrine promote it as much as it can, it is never the more true.

2. But of all the Doctrines in the world, our Doctrine of Perseverance saith most to this purpose; as which saith, that Gods Election from eternity notwithstanding, the Saints shall never come to heaven, unless they decline not, so as to continue in that declining from the waies of godliness; That God himself cannot save them from hell, unless he bring them out of their sins by repentance. So that your next words are an impertinent slander.

[Whereas that Doctrine which promiseth with all possible certainty and assurance, all fulness of blessedness and glory, to those that shall at any time be godly, though they shall the very next day or hour degenerate, and turn loose, and prophane, and continue never so long in such a course, is most manifestly destructive unto godliness, and encouraging above measure to prophaneness.]

What Doctrine of ours, Reverend Sir, ever talked thus? Doth not our Doctrine of Perseverance say, the Saints shall be preserved by the Almighty power of God, if not from *degenerating* to looseness, yet from *continuing* in it so long as they live; and that God hath elected them to repentance as well as to salvation? You are your Crafts-master, and know it were impossible to prove our Doctrine *false*, if you represented it *truely*; but having put it into a *Swines skin*, all the *Curs* in the Country would be ready to worry it, especially your Learning standing by encouraging them. But in sober sadness, Did you ever read or hear such shifts as this, from any youngling Elder? Or did your Lordship in any of your visitations, meet with any such Positions articled against any creature that pretended to *Sion* Colledg, unless perhaps some odd *fellow* of the *new foundation*, that may take more boldness then ordinary, presuming too much on the experience he hath had of your Graces favour, or perhaps hoping to ingratiate himself with your Honour, by casting out somewhat which you might handle as you did the Doctrine of Anti-pædobaptism, *write against* it, and *speak for it*, shew your *zeal* in *confuting* it as *false*, and your *charity* in *pleading* for it as worthy a *toleration*.

SECT. 33. [If it be objected and said; Yea, but the assurance of the unchangeableness of Gods love towards him that is godly, is both a more effectual and perswading motive unto Godliness, and more encouraging unto a persevering in Godliness, then a doubtfulness,

fulneſs or uncertainty whether God will be conſtant in his affection to ſuch a man, or no: Certainty of reward is more encouraging unto action, then uncertainty.] You anſwer ſeveral ways; for a need you can do it as many, as ſome ſubtile birds look at once.

And 1. ſay you, [The Doctrine which teacheth a poſſibility of the Saints final defection, (Remember ours doth ſo, and ſomwhat more then ſo, as to the Saints in themſelves) teacheth an aſſurance of the unchangeableneſs of Gods love towards him that is godly, as well as the Doctrine contrary to it: Only with this difference; the latter Doctrine teacheth the ſaid unchangeableneſs abſolutely, and againſt all poſſible change by ſin and wickedneſs, in the perſon ſuppoſed at preſent to be godly; (You had need waſh your mouth) Whereas the former teacheth and aſſerteth the ſame unchangeableneſs, but conditionally, and upon the Perſeverance of him that is godly in his courſe: So that this Doctrine teacheth as much certainty of the love of God towards him that is godly, as ſuch, and as continuing ſuch, as the other doth.] Yea, but *yours* leaves his *continuing godly* at ſuch an *uncertainty*, that there is a ſorry certainty of *Gods love to him*, as who may immediately fall into a *hatred of God*. Doth your Doctrine [which teacheth the continuance of Gods love to a godly man continuing godly] ſpeak at ſo high a degree of the certainty of Gods love to him, as *ours*, which ſays, *Gods love to him is ſuch*, as will *certainly continue him godly* in the *main*, as long as his life ſhall *continue*; that albeit his Godlineſs may *ſwoun*, it ſhall not *dye*.

2. Say you, [Neither is certainty of Reward in every ſenſe or kind more encouraging unto action, then uncertainty in ſome kind. As to promiſe the ſame reward or prize to him that ſhall not run in the race, which is promiſed upon theſe terms to him that ſhall run, is not more encouraging unto men thus to run, then to promiſe it conditionally, *viz.* upon their running; which is a promiſing of it with uncertainty in this reſpect, *viz.* becauſe it is uncertain whether men will run in the ſaid race or no, and conſequently whether they ſhall receive the ſaid prize or no upon ſuch a promiſe.] Certainly you deſerve a reward for this ſubtile notion, if you ever make it good with all your *running about the buſh*. But, 1. Albeit a man may promiſe one that *needs not run*, the *ſame thing in kind*, which he promiſeth to another *if he ſhall run*; yet is this thing promiſed as a *reward* or *prize* only to *him* that *ſhall run*. The reward or prize carries in the *formality* of it a relation to an action, though the *matter* of that reward or prize may be promiſed *without a condition*, yet is it not promiſed *as a reward or prize*, and ſo not promiſed as an *encouragement*. 2. Albeit a man that promiſeth a reward or prize upon condition of running, leave the perſon to whom he promiſeth it at an uncertainty of obtaining it, becauſe his running is uncertain, and only in the power of him to whom the promiſe is *made*, not of him who *makes* the promiſe; yet God promiſing glory to Perſeverers, hath in his own hand power to *make men perſevere*, and *men have not any* ſuch *power* in their hands. So that your *Simile* runs not on half *four*. Sir, we could have no certainty at all of Gods *reward*, unleſs we were certain he would perform the *condition* for us; and this is our *encouragement*, that *God will work our works in us*, and *help us ſo to run, that we ſhall obtain*. It is but a new daſh of your old calumny, [That our Doctrine promiſeth men the prize whether they act or no, run or ſtand ſtill] If this one miſtake (for we have the charity to think you do not wittingly and wilfully belye us) were taken out of your Book, I am much miſtaken, or your Book would be ſo light, that no *Jockey* would ride the more uneaſily, though he carried half a ſcore of your ſhrunk Volumes in the *nombrel point* of his breeches. But

3. And laſtly, whatever become of it, [This certainty of Gods love, which your Adverſaries are wont to dream of, is not in any thing comparably ſo effectual or prevailing upon men that are godly, to perſevere in godlineſs, as ſuch an uncertainty as hath been aſſerted; nay, it would rather turn him quite aſide unto profaneneſs. And the reaſon is plain; No reward which is promiſed unto men abſolutely, is encouraging to any action whatſoever.] This is much after the rate of old *Battus* his language, the ſame over and over for fear of failing. *Sub illis*

Monti-

Montibus inquit erant, & erant ſub montibus illis.
Montibus inquit erant, & erant ſub montibus illis.

You have ſaid *this ſo often* that is *falſe*, that a man may well conclude you have not *much* to ſay againſt us that is *true*. I may well ſay of all that follows in this Paragraph, what ſomebody ſaid of a new conſtruction of the ninth to the (*Romans*, *It is but an old toot in a new horn*: Or as my old Schoolmaſter ſaid once of a certain exerciſe of mine, wherein I thought I had been rarely witty, *It was like playing with the ſame Jack-an-apes all the day long*. I cannot well tell, whether it were more abominable in *us* to ſay, *God promiſed heaven to men without any condition*, or be more abſurd in *you*, to lay this ever and anon in our diſh; when we look upon it but as a *morſel* that *your ſelf* have *chawed upon*, as long as the *old woman* did on her *brawn*; and it hath gone through your Book as often as that *bullet* had done through the *good Mother* of *Cambridg*, who therefore humbly preſented it to the *Courtiers*, as a Medicine for the *Collick*. I do not think but every leaf of your Book would need a purge of as ſcowring an operation. Sure I am, *this* which you add beſides your thirdly and laſtly, is ſuch as is enough to endanger the life of your whole Volumn.

Say you, [Whether any ſuch aſſurance of the unchangeableneſs of the love of God towards him that is Godly, as the Objection ſpeaks of, can be effectually, and upon ſufficient grounds given unto men, is very queſtionable; yea I conceive there is more reaſon to judg otherwiſe then ſo; yea that which is yet more, I verily believe, that in caſe any ſuch aſſurance of the unchangeableneſs of Gods love, were to be found in, or could regularly be deduced from the Scriptures, it were a juſt ground to any intelligent and conſidering man, to queſtion their Authority, and whether they were from God or no.]

And 1. Is it but [queſtionable, whether any ſuch aſſurance of the unchangeableneſs of the love of God towards him that is godly, as the Objection ſpeaks of, can be effectually, and upon ſufficient grounds given unto men?] Surely *we abhor* the thought of any ſuch aſſurance of the unchangeableneſs of the love of God, towards the moſt godly man upon ſuch terms as the Objection is pretended to ſpeak of: *viz. That albeit the godly man ſhould prove never ſo abominable in Gods ſight, never ſo outragiouſly and deſperately wicked and prophane, yet God ſhould not be at liberty to withhold* the inheritance from him. It ſeems it is but [very queſtionable] with you, whether any ſuch aſſurance of Gods love can be given effectually, and upon ſufficient grounds; which is as much as to ſay, it is *not altogether unqueſtionable*, that ſuch aſſurance *may be given*, and that effectually, and upon ſufficient grounds. And that is as much as to ſay, it is not *altogether evident but that God may poſſibly* out of ſome particular indulgence, or for reaſons known to himſelf, *aſſure a man of the unchangeableneſs of his love to him upon theſe terms*; and ſo it is *not evident*, but a man may be aſſured of the immortal and undefiled inheritance of his grace and favour, though the man be never ſo abominable in his ſight, never ſo outragiouſly and deſperately wicked and prophane. This is that which unqueſtionably follows from this worthy expreſſion of yours whereby you think unmercifully to *load us*, but take all the burthen on a ſudden on your *own ſhoulders*. And you add that which faſtens it cloſely enough to your *back*; [Yea I conceive there is more reaſon to judge otherwiſe then ſo.] It ſeems then you do but [conceive] you are not *aſſured*; and *you* but [*conceive* there is more reaſon to judge otherwiſe then ſo.] But we ſay there is evidence of the firſt magnitude, in that aſſertion, which is directly *contrary* to what you pretend, the Objection affirmed, *viz. That God can unchangeably love a godly man, though degenerate ſo far, as to prove moſt abominable in his ſight, and outragiouſly and deſperately wicked and prophane, ſo as to beſtow on him the immortal and undefiled inheritance in this condition.*

2. But the Objection *ſaies nothing* to this purpoſe; the words are but theſe; *Yea but the aſſurance of the unchangeableneſs of Gods love, towards him that is godly, is both a more effectual and perſwading motive unto godlineſs, and more encouraging unto a perſevering in godlineſs, then a doubtfulneſs or uncertainty, whether God will be conſtant in his*

affection

affection to ſuch a man, or no: Certainty of reward is more encouraging to action, then uncertainty. Sir, the *certainty of reward*, mentioned in the Objection, ſaith nothing of ſuch an unchangeableneſs of Gods love, as to give the reward, *though the man be never ſo abominable in his ſight, never ſo outragiouſly and deſperately wicked and prophane.*

3. The Objectors intend this, that *God is ſo unchangeable in his love to a godly man, as to keep him from being ſo abominable in his ſight, and ſo outragiouſly and deſperately wicked and prophane, that he may not loſe the reward*; and that this is a greater encouragement to godlineſs, that *God himſelf engageth to preſerve him in godlineſs.* *We* ſay nothing to the *purpoſe* of that againſt which *you* diſpute; and therefore,

4. When you add, [Yea that which is yet more, I verily believe that in caſe any ſuch aſſurance of the unchangeableneſs of Gods love, were to be found in, or could regularly be deduced from the Scriptures, it were a juſt ground, to any intelligent and conſidering man, to queſtion their Authority, and whether they were from God or no.]

I deſire to know, 1. Whether you mean it of *ſuch aſſurance of the unchangeableneſs of Gods love*, as you repreſent forſooth in what follows,] That God ſhould not withhold the immortal and undefiled inheritance of his grace and favour from a godly man, though he ſhould prove never ſo abominable in his ſight, never ſo deſperately or outragiouſly wicked and prophane?] And if ſo, *we abhor* the *conceit*, and you ſpeak nothing *againſt us.* *We* ſay, God doth withhold the immortal, and undefiled inheritance, from the *moſt godly man fallen into any notorious ſin, till he have brought him to repentance.*

2. Whether you mean it of *ſuch an aſſurance of the unchangeableneſs of Gods love to a godly man, as to preſerve him from every evil work unto his heavenly kingdom*, either by *keeping him from ſuch work*, or by *bringing him to repentance for it*? And if ſo then are we ready to produce Scriptures which import no leſs; as

The gifts and calling of God are without repentance. *Rom.* 11.29.

Whom he loves, he loves to the end. *John* 13. 1.

He will put his fear into their hearts, that they ſhall not depart from him. *Jer.* 32. 40.

Though we deny him, he abides faithfull, and cannot deny himſelf. 2 *Tim.* 2.13.

Cum multis aliis.

And hereupon we have the charity to hope you will inſtead of [denying the Authority of the Scriptures] ingenuouſly confeſs, you have dictated all this *without book*: and that this part of *your writings*, was from a ſpirit contrary to that which indited the holy Scriptures. That which follows, That [ſome in *Malachy* ſaid, *The Lord delighteth in every one that doth evil, and where is the God of judgment?*] is I hope far from the ſenſe of all *Chriſtians*, or *ſober men*. *We* ſay, God delights to keep his Saints from doing evil, and to renew them by repentance, after they have fallen into evil; yea that he makes them *abhor themſelves for every evil*, ſo far is he from *delighting himſelf in men doing evil.* We ſay he is ſo *the God of judgment*, that he ſeverely *chaſtizeth*, thoſe whom he moſt *delights in*; when they are betrayed into *any evil*, though *againſt their will*; and that he requires his children, *as they call him Father, who without reſpect of perſons judgeth righteouſly, to paſs the time of their ſojourning here in fear.* 1 Pet. 1. 17.

You bethink your ſelf of [another Objection which poſſibly ſome may further make againſt the Argument in hand, that *Unleſs the Saints be aſſured of the perpetuity of their ſtanding in the grace and favour of God, they muſt needs be under fears of falling away, and ſo of periſhing; and fear we know is of a diſcouraging and enfeebling nature, an enemy unto ſuch actions, which men of confidence and courage are apt and ready to undertake.*] SECT. 34.

You anſwer, and,

1. Unanſwerably, [That you have trodden down the ſtrength of this Objection more then once] and ſend your Reader to *Sect.* 15. & 16. of this *Chap.* and to the 9. *Chap.* in either of which places he may find it *ſprawling* in the dirt at your feet. However it made a ſhift to get upon *its legs* again, and to bend its *fiſt* at leaſt, if not to deal a good *blow* at your head; and whereupon you are fain to add,

2. [That the Saints, notwithſtanding the poſſibility of their final falling away, have, or may have ſuch an aſſurance of the perpetuity of their ſtanding in the grace and favour of God, which may exclude all fear, at leaſt that is of a diſcouraging or enfeebling nature.]

I anſwer to this ſecond Anſwer, as briefly as you anſwer the firſt. Let the Reader but look back to the 16 *Sect.* of this *Chap.* where he ſhall ſee upon what ground it was, [that the Apoſtle lived at ſo high a rate of confidence, as to ſay, the *Principalities and powers could not ſeparate him from the love of God*] Albeit I dare not ſecond you in ſaying [that in his confidence and courage he equalized the holy Angels themſelvs] Sure he could not, if he knew it poſſible, as you pretend, that he might become a Reprobate. Only I muſt needs ſay, you hold it not impoſſible that the holy Angels ſhould become Reprobates, as [being in a *poſſibility of ſinning*, though not altogether ſo neer as Regenerate men;] and ſo, neither could *they* be over-certain that they ſhould not finally fall away. And upon theſe grounds you may ſomwhat rationally affirm, [that *Paul* lived almoſt at as high a rate of confidence as the Angels themſelves:] But that it was altogether impoſſible for *Paul* to become a *Reprobate*, and that he ſaith nothing to the contrary, hath been evinced ſufficiently upon the place. So that I ſhall not put the Reader to a new trouble *here*; only I cannot paſs by your [Simile of a *deep well* or *pit of water* in the yard] without taking a little *ſwig* after this dry piece which you have given us.

[Suppoſe a man hath a deep well, or pit of water in his yard, or grounds near adjoining to his houſe; he is no more afraid of being drowned either in the one or the other, then he that lives a thouſand miles diſtance from them. The reaſon is, becauſe he knows he need not be in any danger of ſuch a miſcarriage by them, unleſs he pleaſe.]

1. This *Simile* is to be commended for *this*, that it puts a [man at a thouſand miles diſtance] at no danger of being drowned [*in the well in the yard*;] and I verily think the Angels were *no leſs diſtant* from that *pit* whereinto St. *Paul* might have fallen. 2. But there is as great an impoſſibility of the mans drowning while he is [at a thouſand miles diſtance] as of the drowning of the Devil upon *Clow-moor*: And not a far greater impoſſibility of *this*, (as much as the Proverb in *Devonſhire* hath had the countenance to report it *actually done*) then that the holy Angels ſhould fall. So that hitherto we are not like to quarrel much with your *Simile*. But 3. why [a man ſhould be no more afraid of being drowned in a well or pit in his yard, and grounds near adjoining to his houſe, then a man that lives at a thouſand miles diſtance.] I underſtand not: For why may not a man be *drowned* in it, as he *walks* in the *dark*; and hath his head, like as *yours* may be *ſometimes*, and *mine* I confeſs is very *often*, ſo full of Proclamations, that it doth not think of the *way*. I ſee not but in this caſe a man full of thoughts, or in a brown ſtudy, may very poſſibly fall into a [Well in his yard] as well as *knock his head againſt a poſt*, and cry, *Good wits jump*. Nay, why may it not be credible, that a man *ſtooping to take water*, may *fall into the well* and be *drowned*? Sure here is a *poſſibility*, and need of a *provident fear*; and ſuch we yield *neceſſary* in *every Saint*, leſt he *fall* into the moſt *abominable ſin*; he will, if left to *himſelf*, *quickly fall, never riſe again*. But 4. there is more cauſe of fear in a *Saint* leſt he fall thus, then in any *man* left to be [drowned in a pit or well in his yard.] A man hath *no temptations*, unleſs in ſome deep melancholy, to caſt himſelf into a *well*: A *Saint* hath every houre to *fall into ſin*; and will confeſs in all humility, that were not *God pleaſed* to keep him from *himſelf*, as well as the *Devil*, he ſhould immediately *deſtroy himſelf*, yea and *pleaſe himſelf in it*. Take now all the reſt of this piece of your Anſwer, and put it to what neceſſary uſes you pleaſe. Sir, *We* preſume not to ſay, *we* can will to prevent our evils in any kind, longer then *God* prevent us by his grace; and ſeeing it

is

is he alone who *works in us to will, as well as to do, of his own good pleasure*, we hold our selves bound to *work out our salvation with fear and trembling* as to *our selves*, and yet with an *holy confidence* in respect of *God*, who cannot so far *forget* his *promise* as to *forsake* his *Saints*.

Not satisfied with this second answer, you think good to add

3. And lastly, [That an assurance of a perpetual enjoyment of, or abiding in the love and favour of God, otherwise then upon condition of love and loyalty in the creature to him, is neither honourable for God to make or grant, nor meet for a creature to expect or desire.]

Nor I hope do we pretend it is: We say, God assures us that he will preserve us in love and loyalty to him so far, as not to renounce it; and that is the assurance we have of his favour so as to bring us to *glory*, that he hath assured us of his favour so as to keep us by his *grace*. Make now as ridiculous an Oration as you please, and put it upon us, that [*we* put it into the mouth of God:] The Reader of common intelligence will easily discern that it is but Grollery in *you*, to charge *us* with such blasphemy as this which follows; as if we made God say, [Though thou addest drunkenness to thirst, and polluteſt thy self with all the abominations of wicked and ungodly men; though thou committeſt whoredom, adultery, incest, murther, theft; though thou hatest to be reformed, and castest all my commandments behind thy back, &c. yet shalt thou be precious in mine eyes, and mine heart shall be towards thee in the dearest love and affection for ever, and thou shalt inherit my everlasting Kingdom, thy desperate Rebellions against me notwithstanding.]

This is such a Speech, as your rare ingenuity fairly confesseth [your Adversaries will not bear; nor are they wont to deliver themselves, and express their Doctrine in such terms as these.] You may swear for it. [But yet you appeal to their consciences, whether the Doctrine of Perseverance doth not without any wresting, or straining, or perverting in the least, directly lead to such an horrid thought of God.] No, Sir; Our consciences are assured there is nothing in that Doctrine of any such tendencie and import; unless it be (forsooth) in representing God as saying, —*I so love thee, that thou shalt be either graciously preserved by me from falling into such abominations, or at least from lying in them with a hatred to be reformed: Thou shalt find me a Father in my corrections, every time thou forgettest the obedience of a child; thou shalt be scourged to Repentance, every time thou art lashing out into ought that looks like Rebellion; thou shalt feel a tumult in thy conscience, every time thou art apt to make a league with sin; thou shalt suffer a torment in thy bosom, every time thou art caught by a temptation in thy eyes; thou shalt be as it were plunged into hell, every time thou behavest thy self otherwise then becomes an heir of heaven. I will bring thee indeed to a throne there; but upon every unworthy carriage of thine, (of which thou art ever and anon apt to be guilty) I will lay thee almost as low as the bottomless pit. I will save thee, but so as by fire; and make thee run through fire and water, ere I bring thee out into that wealthy place. Know it was purchased for thee with my Sons blood; thou must not think to do ought that forfeits it, but it shall stand thee in many a tear. I am resolved to invest thee with glory, but I will first strip thee naked, and make thee abhor thy self both for thy sins, and for thy righteousness: make thee afraid of thy righteousness, as being stained with too sad a mixture of iniquities; and more of all iniquities, which shall present themselves to thee in their proper hue. I will make thee so hate sin, that thou shalt accept of the punishment of it, and bless me for visiting thy offences with my rods, as well as crowning my graces which I have bestowed on thee, with the glory which I have reserved for thee.* If *this* and *yours* be *one*, *heaven* and *hell* are not *two*. We justly return that eloquent *Harangue* of *yours* to that *black pit* where it was drawn up: They are mistaken who think it is only of the inspiration of *Colemanstreet*.

As [certain as you are of Christs resolving *his abiding in his Fathers love*, *into the keeping of his Commandments*, and of his informing his Disciples that *he loves them* upon the same terms.] I desire the Reader but to have recourse to my Answer to the 16. Section of your 9. Chapter; and I am in good hope he will see, I need say nothing here, save only to what you add according to your wont, [by the way, that

had there been an unavoidable neceſſity of continuing in Chriſts love, lying upon the Diſciples, there had been no neceſſity of his exhortation to them, in order thereunto. Who perſwades a man to do that which is not in his power to neglect, or not to do?] Alas, Sir, We ſay the Saints are ſo far from [lying under an unavoidable neceſſity of continuing in Chriſts love] That we ſay, *they forfeit it every moment*, in reſpect of the *deſert* of their ſins, and could not *poſſibly recover it*, if they were left to *themſelves*, and that they are fain to be beholding to more then *exhortations* to *reduce* them, no leſs then an eminent work of Chriſts *ſpirit*, and the ſpirit of Chriſt hath thought fit to uſe theſe *exhortations*; and that this is no waies abſurd, hath been at large made good in my anſwer to the ſecond Argument alleadged by you in the third Section of this Chapter, where you laid out all your ſtrength, and that hath appeared too weak to carry it againſt us.

And though you tell us, [That to pretend our weakneſs, is not to abate the force of your plea, and to pretend nothing but what hath been already anſwered, eſpecially in the ninth Chapter,] (where the Reader may ſee how well you have done it,) yet you add here,

[1. That the weakneſs of the fleſh, or the aptneſs of miſcarrying through this, is no reaſonable ground of fear, to any true believer, of his periſhing; conſidering that no man loſeth, or forfeiteth the grace and favour of God through ſins of weakneſs or infirmity. It is only the ſtrength of ſin and corruption in men, that expoſeth them to the danger of loſing the love of God.]

But ſay I,

1. The *weakneſs of believers*, is that, which leaves way for *ſin* to break in upon them, in its full *ſtrength*.

And 2. There is *no ſin of weakneſs*, but is againſt the *Law*, and conſequently *forfeiteth* the *grace* and *favour* of God, though it make not that a man *loſeth it*, ſuch is Gods goodneſs to us in the ſecond Covenant. Good Mr. *Goodwin*, a man may *forfeit* his *right*, though he *loſe* not his *poſſeſſion*; and he may *loſe* his *right* at *Common Law*, albeit he be *reſtored* by *Chancery*.

Now there is no wiſe man, but would be *afraid* of the *forfeiture*, though he be well *aſſured* he ſhall not *loſe* the *poſſeſſion*, and be *afraid* to *loſe his right at Law*, though he be never ſo well *aſſured* of having it *reſtored* by the *Court of Equity*. The *Saints infirmities* expoſe them to *danger of loſing the love of God*, albeit the *danger* may be *avoided* by *repentance*, and *that repentance* is not to be had, but from *the love of God*, (*ſay we*) which was *forfeited*. You that have power enough to *repent* at your *pleaſure*, need not be ſo *afraid* of *ſins of infirmity*; you muſt be deſired to *pardon our timorouſneſs*, who poor men, are *ſenſible* of the *danger of loſing the love of God*, are not *privie* to our ſelves of any *way* to *prevent* the *miſchief* by any *ability* of our own to *repent*.

And howbeit you add,

2. [If the Saints be willing to ſtrengthen the ſpirit in them, and make him willing proportionably to the means vouchſafed unto them by God for ſuch a purpoſe, this will fully ballance the weakneſs of the fleſh, and prevent the miſcarriage, and breakings out hereof.]

Yet, I muſt tell you, That the *Spirit* muſt make the *Saints* to be *willing*; the *Saints* cannot at any time *ſtrengthen the ſpirit* at all, as much as they can *grieve* him too often; and therefore unleſs you can ſhew the Saints, how they are ſo ſtrong in the midſt of their infirmities, as to be able to *ſtrengthen the ſpirit*, whereas we were wont to conceive they ow'd all their good *willings* to him; their *weakneſs* is ſtill *ſtrong* enough to bear down the Scale. They cannot (Man) *walk in the ſpirit*, but only *by the ſpirit*; when *they are led by the ſpirit*, they are, I ſuppoſe, more *paſſive* then *active*. He not only *ſhews* them the way, but *holds* them up in it; and that they *follow him*, they owe it more to his *hand* which gently draws them, then to their own *feet*, on which elſe they could neither *go* nor *ſtand*. It is true, [they are not under the *Law*, *while they are led by the ſpirit*, and ſo long in no danger of loſing the favour of God;] but as ſoon as they leave the Conduct of the Spirit, the *Law* is ready to *arreſt* them; nor can they in all the world, find any that can *bail* them.

3. But

3. But say you, [There is no such aptness, or proneness unto sins, sins you mean of a disinheriting import in Saints, or true believers, as is pretended.] Would you could make this good; you little think how much you would engage the Saints by it, more then by all the Books you published in your life. Surely they are *all sensible* of such an unhappy *aptness* and *proneness* unto sin, and do not [pretend to it] without too much cause; there is no great *comfort* to be taken in *charging* themselves with this [aptness and proneness,] nor can I think it is any *secret self-love* or *pride*, that makes them thus [pretend to it] muchless any *perverse ambition*, that puts them on displaying their [aptness and proneness to sins of a disinheriting import.] They cannot allow themselves to deny that [aptness and proneness to such sins] in *themselves*, which they found in *many Saints*, whom they humbly acknowledged to have been *far better* then themselves.

Every time they hear of *Davids* sins, [surely of no less then [a disinheriting import,] they are jealous of themselves, what would become of them, if left to themselves. What man is without an untoward [aptness, and perverse proneness] to those sins whereunto *David* was so fearfully transported? yea what is there in the *hearts of other men*, when there was so much of this in *his*, who was *a man after Gods own heart*? [A strong propension or inclination unto righteousness reigning in them] is a phrase out of your own Mint; the Saints fear lest *sin* should *reign in their mortal bodies*, they use not to talk too much of [the propension and inclination to righteousness reigning in them] (though it be the humble desire of every good heart) but sure they are, *there is a Law in their members, rebelling against the Law of their minds*, when it *reigns* most gloriously, and ever and anon *leading them away captive unto the Law of sin*; and were it not that the *Lord reigneth, and doth whatever he will, as in heaven, so in earth*; nothing were able to stifle the *madness* that is too often found in the best of his *people*. All *propensions* and *inclinations* to *righteousness*, the Saints acknowledg, are as all other good gifts, so many *derivations* from the *Father of lights*, let him cease from *irradiating*, and altogether *withhold* his *beams*, but for *one moment*, the most *light some soul* will be as *dark* as *pitch*; as but *shut* the *windows*, and the *fairest Gallery* will be as *black* as *midnight*. [The spirit] it is true [which is *in the Saints*, *is stronger then that which is in the world*;] but there is no *grace* of the *spirit* in the Saints, but there is so much *corruption* of *nature* in them, as to *overmatch* it: And should not *God supply* them with *new influences*, all the oldest *graces*, and which are best *radicated*, would *immediately vanish*. *Grace* is such a quality as depends like *light*, more from the *efficient* then the *subject*. True, [*whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin, for his seed remains in him*.] But *that the seed remains in him*, is from the *Sower*, not from the *Ground*: He *keeps* the *seed* in the *ground*, else the *ground* would *kill* the *seed*. True again, [*He who committeth sin, is of the Devil*,] and consequently no Saint, or true believer. But that any Saint, or true believer continueth such, and doth not *commit sin even with greediness*, is from *God alone*, not from *himself*. The Devil, as I may say, had the *possession* of us *all* at first, and would soon *recover* it, did not *God* by his Almighty power *keep him out*. The *children of God*, would all become *slaves to the devil*, did not *God*, who *first made* them, *still keep* them his children. *This is the love of God, that we keep his Commandements*, even in this sense too, that *he*, out of *his love*, helps us to keep them; It is from *his love to us*, that we are brought to have any *love to him*. It is *this alone*, which makes that *his Commandments are not grievous*. The *lightest* of them are *burthens*, which no man, left to *himself*, would bear.

Lastly, true it is, that [*our Faith is a victory which overcomes the world*,] but *our faith* is *Gods gift*; and that not only as to the *beginning*, but the *continuance* of it: He who is the *Author*, is the *Upholder* of it.

Goe now, and brag as much as you list, of [a pregnant, strong, triumphing propension in all true believers, to walk holily, and to live righteously,] but remember, this is meerly from *God*, not from *themselves*) and without him, as [easie a mysterie,] as your Learning makes it, [for Saints to refrain from sinning customarily, and against conscience,] I know, the Saints will generally confess, they find a *hard task* of

it

it to keep down their corruptions, after they are moſt *weakned*; they are ſtill *ſtrong* enough to find work for the *Spirit*; *& nunquam bona fide manſuescunt, & tranquilli maris æstus*. Such as may make the beſt Saint afraid of ſuffering *ſhipwrack*, were he not aſſured that Chriſt hath engaged himſelf to bring him ſafe to the *haven* of happineſs. For a concluſion, I deſire it may be obſerved that *you* who diſpute for the *Apoſtaſie of the Saints*, attribute *more power* to the Saints to *preſerve themſelves from it*, then *we*: *We* who diſpute for the *Perſeverance of the Saints*, aſcribe it wholly to the *faithfulneſs of God*. Let who will be Judge, *which Doctrine is moſt according to Godlineſs*. *Let God be true, and every man a liar*.

SECT. 36. *Arg.* 7. [That Doctrine, whoſe genuine and proper tendencie is to advance the peace and joy of the Saints in believing, is of a natural ſympathie with the Goſpel, and upon this account a truth. But ſuch is the Doctrine which informeth the Saints of a poſſibility of their total and final falling away. *Ergo.*]

For the proof of the *Minor*, you refer your Reader to your 9. *Chapter*. I pray let him ſee there my Anſwer: and for the preſent, this is that, which though you think it *enough* to propoſe it again, I think it *too much* to refell it again; ſo notorious a contradiction to common ſenſe doth this learned Reaſon of yours carry in the forehead of it. And truly your adventuring to plead the comfortableneſs of your Doctrine, doth only ſhew there is nothing ſo aliene and abhorring from all *probability*, which you, in the confidence of your parts, dare not undertake to maintain.

SECT. 37. *Arg.* 8. [That Doctrine which evacuates and turns into folly all that gracious Counſel of the Holy Ghoſt, which conſiſts partly in that diligent information which he gives unto the Saints from place to place, concerning the hoſtile, cruel, and bloody intentions of Satan againſt them; partly in detecting and making known unto them all his ſubtle ſtratagems, his plots, methods, and dangerous machinations againſt them; partly alſo in furniſhing them with ſpiritual weapons of all ſorts, whereby they may be able to grapple with him notwithſtanding, and gloriouſly to triumph over him. Partly again in thoſe frequent Admonitions, Exhortations, Encouragements, to quit themſelves like men, in reſiſting him, and making good their ground againſt him, which are found in the Scriptures: And laſtly, in profeſſing his fear leſt Satan ſhould circumvent and deceive them. That Doctrine which reflects diſparagement and vanity upon all theſe moſt gracious applications of the Holy Ghoſt unto the Saints, muſt needs be a Doctrine of vanity and error; and conſequently, that which oppoſeth it, a truth. But this doth the Doctrine of Perſeverance, *Ergo*.]

The *Major* of this Argument, I grant, is beyond exception: The *Minor* had need be proved very ſubſtantially, or elſe it will be found guilty of that *hainous crime* which it ſo confidently chargeth upon us. To convict it of the wrong it doth others, I need ſay no more then what I did to your *third Argument*, which differeth from the *preſent* only in this; that *that* charged us with [evacuating the wiſdome of God in warning us of our own corruptions and infirmities,] and *this*, [in minding us of Satans policie and power.] Yet I will have the patience to examine particularly the allegations which you bring, in a Speech pretended [to be framed by the Holy Ghoſt, according to the tenor of our Doctrine, thus. O ye that truly believe, who by vertue of the promiſe of that God that cannot lye, are fully perſwaded and poſſeſt that you ſhall be kept by God, by his irreſiſtible grace, in true faith, untill death: So that though Satan ſhall ſet his wits awork, and by all his ſtratagems, ſnares, and cunning devices ſeek to deſtroy you; yea, though he ſhould entice you away from God by the allurements of the world, and entangle you with them again; yea, and ſhould cauſe you to run and ruſh headlong, againſt the light of your own judgments and conſciences, into all manner of horrid ſins and abominations; yet ſhall all his attempts and aſſaults againſt you in every kind be in vain, you ſhall be in never the more danger or poſſibility of periſhing. Unto *you* I ſay attend, and conſider how ſore and dangerous a combate you are like to ſuſtain; for you are to wreſtle not againſt fleſh and blood, but againſt principalities and powers, the Governours of this world, and ſpiritual wickedneſſes; againſt that old Serpent the Devil, that great red Dragon, who was a Murtherer

therer from the beginning, and who ſtill goes about like a roaring Lyon, ſeeking whom he may devour; who will ſet himſelf with all his might to thruſt you headlong into all manner of ſins, and ſo to ſeparate between God and you for ever. And truly, I am afraid, leſt as the Serpent by his ſubtilty deceived *Eve*, ſo your minds ſhould be corrupted from the ſimplicity which is in Chriſt Jeſus; leſt the Tempter ſhould any ways tempt you, and my labour about you ſhould be in vain. Therefore watch, pray, and reſiſt him ſtedfaſt in the faith; take unto you the whole armour of God, that you may be able to reſiſt in an evil day, and having done all things, ſtand faſt; ſtand, having your loins girt with the girdle of truth, and the breaſt-plate of righteouſneſs upon you, &c.]

I may not wrong you ſo much, as not to acknowledge how rare a *faculty* you have in making Speeches of moſt *eloquent non-ſenſe*; and it ſeems you take no ſmall *felicity* in it, by your frequent imploying your *talent* in this kind. Sir *Gregory Nonſenſe*, though he had *ſtronger lungs*, yet nothing ſo *ſmooth* a *tongue* as you, to whom he may think it no diſparagement to reſign the place, and let you ſpeak as the chief man of worſhip upon the bench. Had *Peter* been arraigned before *you* for denying his Maſter, how graciouſly would you have acquitted him upon *your principles*, and have beſpoken him at ſuch a rate of compaſſion as this:

Peter, thou knoweſt thy Maſter hath been pleaſed to dignifie thee with the *Keyes* of *Heaven*; and *that* hath enraged the *gates of hell* with an implacable fury againſt thee: Satan, who hath all along *deſired to winnow all* thy brethren as *wheat*, intended to *ſift thee* more narrowly then *all the reſt*, and he did not deſiſt till he had betrayed thee to ſomwhat an unworthy denial of thy bleſſed Maſter; yea, thy Maſter foretold thee of it, and thou couldſt not poſſibly prevent it, but that thou muſt deny him thrice as it were with one breath; but withall he prayed for thee, and queſtionleſs he obtained his ſuit; yea, he aſſured thee of it, that thy *faith ſhould not fail*. We have no reaſon but to *diſcharge thee upon this ground*. What doſt thou trouble thy ſelf to weep too bitterly? alas, thou wert in no danger by thy fall; hadſt not *thou fallen*, thy Maſters *word* had not *ſtood*; juſtly mighteſt thou have *denied him*, if thou hadſt *not denied him*. Trouble not thy ſelf too much, all is well enough between *thee* and *thy Maſter*, and *our Worſhips*; nor needeſt thou fear any evil conſequence of *thy denial*, which rather makes for the *advancement* of thy Maſters *honour*. Hadſt thou taken *ſuch care* as ſome would have adviſed thee, *not to deny him*, how had thy Maſter ſuffered in his *reputation* with *all the Diſciples*? Thou hadſt not been ſo *true to his intereſt* as it became thee, hadſt thou not been a little *faithleſs at this turn*, where *thy denial* contributes ſo ſignally to *his honour*.

But now for the *Speech* which *you* are pleaſed to father on *us*, *we* ſay, That the Saints, albeit they may know themſelves to be ſufficiently ſafe from falling away by any temptations of Satan, as being preſerved by the overruling hand of their good God; yet are they *in danger* by *every ſlip*. Is there no danger, trow you, to them by their *falling*, becauſe they ſhall be ſaved from *breaking their necks*? Cannot they *wound*, becauſe they cannot *deſtroy* themſelves? Are they in no poſſibility of *prejudicing themſelves*, becauſe not of *periſhing*? The very *falling* or *falſring*, is ſome *diſhonour* to them; the *ſtumbling* may occaſion a *hurting* their *ſhins*, perhaps the *breaking their legs*; and they have cauſe enough, we think, to beware even of this: and accordingly the Holy Ghoſt may well enough exhort them to *walk with all care*, without any diſparagement to his *wiſdom*. The *ſnare* may catch them, ſo as to *hinder* them in their *journey*; the *darts* of Satan may ſtrike them in the *boſome*, though not through the *heart*; they may ſuffer many a *torment* by them all their *life long*, albeit they *dye* not of it. *You* think we need not be afraid of any thing but *hell*: yes, Sir, there are *troubles* of ſpirit, *diſturbances* of our peace, *diſhonour* of our profeſſion, a *thouſand things* more, which as *light* as *you* make of them, the *Saints* are ſadly *agrieved* with, and accordingly as much *afraid* of them; and the Holy Ghoſt counſels them in his tender care of them to beware of ſuch *miſchiefs*. And this may ſerve for an anſwer to this quaint Oration, which *you* ſay *we* put upon the Holy Ghoſt. Sir, the *dangers* of the *Saints* are ſo many, albeit their *ſalvation* be *certain*, that theſe cauti-

ons,

SECT. 38. ons, admonitions, are of conſtant uſe to them: and whereas you boaſt [you have ſhewed the vanity of this Plea, from Sect. 4. of this Chapter, to the end of Sect. 16.] I am content to ſay no more then I have already done upon that place.

We grant a *poſſibility* of the *loſs* of ſalvation, yea an *impoſſibility* of *holding* it, as to the Saints left to *themſelves*, and much more to the *Devil*: *Gods care* over them, ſhews the neceſſity of *their own*. Theſe poor *doves*, albeit they be ſafe under *his wing*, may not caſt themſelves into the *Dragons tallons*; albeit theſe poor *lambs* be ſecured by the hand of their *great Shepherd*, they have cauſ enough to beware of the *Paw* of the *Lyon*. It is true, *Gods being for us*, aſſures us, *more ſhall be againſt us*, ſo as to *prevail* over us, but the *more* will be againſt us, ſo as to *beſet* and *beſiege* us. The Devill adventured to tempt even *Chriſt himſelf*, and therefore no *Chriſtian* can be *too much afraid* of him.

SECT. 39. Nor matters it though [the Holy Ghoſt did not thus apply himſelf unto Chriſt,] *Chriſt* applied *himſelf* to the *Holy Ghoſt*, as I may ſay, and uſed paſſages of *Scriptures*, whereby to repell the *Devil*, and put him off with *It is written*, *Thou ſhalt not tempt the Lord thy God*; a paſſage applied to *himſelf*, *Thou*, not to the *Devil*, for *whoſe inſtruction* I never read that the *Holy Ghoſt* applied himſelf in the *Scriptures*: Chriſt as *man*, made uſe of the *Scriptures* in *this kind* more then *once*; *Man ſhall not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. He ſhall give his Angels charge of thee to keep thee in all thy waies, that thou daſh not thy foot againſt a ſtone* Chriſt as *man* was ſubject to the *ſame infirmities* that *we* are, and uſed the *ſame remedies*, yet an *impoſſibility* I yield, of *his miſcarrying* more then *ours*, yea or the *Saints in heaven*, *without infirmity*, in regard of that [*Hypoſtatical union*] you ſpeak of, but even that *union* let him not as *man* above *Ordinances*; we find him *praying*, *ſinging*, *reading*, and uſing *all thoſe* holy means which are recommended to *us*.

SECT. 40. That which you ſpeak of [the neceſſity of doing righteouſneſs, and obeying the will of God, reſting upon the will of Chriſt,] is I yield [no way prejudicial to the rewardableneſs of what he did,] nor doth Gods working in the Saints all the good they do, render it *ſo* to *them*. [The reaſon of the difference] which you render, is none; [*viz.* That this neceſſity was contracted by Chriſt himſelf, and that voluntarily and freely, the God-head, or the Divine Nature, voluntarily or freely deriving unto the humane, ſo united to it, ſuch a fulneſs of grace, holyneſs, and goodneſs, from whence this neceſſity proceeded.] That as *man* did not concur actively, [freely, voluntarily] in *this*, but was all as *paſſive* in reſpect of this *union*; and conſequently, the *neceſſity* of doing righteouſneſs, as any of the *Saints*. So little doth this grave conſideration of yours, weigh in the preſent caſe.

SECT. 41. I am come at laſt to your ninth and laſt Argument, which runs thus:

[That Doctrine which naturally and directly tendeth to beget and foment jealouſies and evil ſurmiſes between brethren in Chriſt, or ſuch as ought cordially to love, reverence, and honour one another, is not confederate with the Goſpel, nor from God; and conſequently that which contradicteth it muſt needs be a truth. The common Doctrine of Perſeverance is a Doctrine of this tendency. *Ergo.*]

I will be no adverſary to your *Major*; the *Minor* hath need of a ſtronger foundation then ordinary to ſupport it. That which you lay, is this,

That [The Doctrine of Perſeverance teacheth you to judge the faith and love of thoſe whom you ought to love as brethren in Chriſt, to be no better then the faith and love of hypocrites, diſſemblers, and formal profeſſors, and is of the ſame tendency, to occaſion them to meaſure back again the ſame meaſure to you.] Your Reaſon? why [becauſe you cannot judge the faith and love of thoſe, whom you ſtand moſt bound by the Law of Chriſt to love, reverence, and honour as Saints, to be better then you have ſometimes, or ought to have judged the faith and love of thoſe whom this Doctrine teacheth you to judge to have been hypocrites and falſe-hearted men, when they were at beſt.] All amounts but to *this*, our Doctrine can give you *no aſſurance of any other man, that he is not hollow at the heart*; and ſhe readily acknowledgeth it, as not pretending to give you *that*, which *ſhe* thought you would

would have been content, God ſhould have enjoyed, as *his incommunicable prerogative, to know the hearts of men*; but yet ſhe teacheth you *not to be jealous of any without juſt grounds*; ſeeing *you do not know any mans heart*, to *hope* the *beſt of all*, againſt whom you have *no juſt exception*; yea, and to *hope well* of thoſe *who fall*, that they *may riſe* again, rather then to *diſtruſt* thoſe that *ſtand*, that they will *fall*. And what better ſecurity doth *your own Doctrine* afford you of the *beſt*, but that they *may fall*, and that *finally*? *Our Doctrine* bids you *hope* that you may *meet thoſe in heaven*, whom for the preſent you have juſt cauſe to *leave on earth*; *yours* bids you *doubt of* the *beſt men* with whom you moſt ſweetly converſe on *earth*, that ever you ſhall have their company in *heaven*. *Yours* bids you *doubt* at every turn, that the *beſt Saints* may prove *curſed apoſtates*; *Ours* ſaith that you may be *aſſured if they be true Saints* (and your charity having no ground to believe the contrary, ought not to be too forward to ſuſpect the contrary) that *they will continue ſo to the end*; and that though they *fall*, they ſhall *riſe again*, and miniſter to you more matter of *joy* by their *repentance*, then of *ſorrow* by their *fall*; yea that whiles they *fall*, their *hearts* have an *eye* towards *heaven*; and *God* hath an *eye* to *them*, and will keep them from *lying down for ever*.

The Premiſes conſidered, our Doctrine is hitherto not ſo worſted, bnt that ſhe hopes to gain ground by all your incroachments, and to ſtand the firmer for your vain endeavours to overthrow her; and that the *ſtrength* on your ſide in *oppoſing* her, and the *weakneſs* on our part in *defending* her, make not a little for *Gods glory*, and the *evidence of her truth*; ſhe that is *reſcued* from your hands, by ſo *inconſiderable a pen*; how had ſhe *triumphed* over you, had the Univerſity of *Cambridg*, or the Synod at *Weſtminſter*, been imployed in her behalf? What would not their *Silver Trumpets* have done, when even a rude Corniſh *Rams-horn* is enough to *blow down your* fortifications, and put all your Forces to *flight*.

Suis & ipſa Roma viribus ruit.

CHAP. VI.

In Answer to Chapter 14. *of Mr.* Goodwins *Book, the sixth of his Digression, pretending to Exhibit from the Scriptures, some instances of a total declining or falling away from the Grace and Favour of God, in true Believers.*

SECT. 1. THis Chapter, we are told, is [A Surplusage.] The *preceding*, I wis, have so fully done the business, and so clearly evicted the falling of the Saints, that nothing can stand before them. The Cause of Perseverance is already in the bottom of the deep, and in no possibility of rising; this Millstone is thrown after onely *ex superabundanti*.

And 1. The Example of *David* is alleadged, [Concerning whom it is presumed no man questioneth, but that he was as true and real a Saint and believer, before the perpetration of those two horrid sins, of Murther, and Adultery, as he was after his repentance. The Question is, whether he continued such, truely godly under the guilt of the said sins, *viz.* from the time of the perpetration of them, untill the time of his repentance?] I make some doubt whether this be the question, [whether he continued such as he was before, during the guilt of these sins?] But rather, *Whether he did altogether lose the seeds of his faith and godliness?* That he was a *believer* and a *Saint*, during the perpetration of these sins, I yield we affirm; *Believer* and *Saint*, are *nominals*; but that he *continued a Believer, or Saint*, as that word *continued*, seems to put *Believer* and *Saints* into the quality of *participles*, viz. *acting belief* and *holyness*, I deny. As sometimes *Participles* put on the capacity of *Nouns*, so at other times do *Nouns*, being attendance upon a *Verb*, put on the capacity of *Participles*, and connotate an *act* or *passion*, with relation to the several circumstances of *time* expressed by the *Verb*: As when I say thus, *you are now very rational*, this *rational*, though a *Noun*, yet here becomes equivalent to a *Participle*, and signifies as much as *discoursing rationally*; or when I say thus, *You are now very valiant*, this *Valiant*, though a *Nown*, yet here becomes deputy to a *Participle*, and signifies as much as *acting valiantly*. So in the case in hand, *David was a believer and godly, during the time of his impenitency: Believer* and *Godly* may be supposed to signifie *participially*; and so we *deny him* to have been *believer* and *godly*; but take them as they are *honest Nouns*, and so preserv'd from all *acting*; and we say, he was even *then* a *believer* and *godly*, that is, he was *such*, as to the *habits* of *belief* and *godliness*, albeit he was *not such*, as to the *act*.

What say you against this? Why,

SECT. 2. [He that commits Murther and Adultery, not only against the clear light of his conscience, but with deliberation, and premeditated contrivance, and remains under the pollution and guilt of these sins, without repentance, is not a man truly godly, or accepted with God. But this was *Davids* case. *Ergo.*

The Minor, say you, is in all points evident from the tenor of that Story laid down *Chap.* 11. 12. of the second of *Samuel*, and hath so much light of truth shining in it, that they who deny the conclusion, will not deny it.]

Yet if we should, you will be put to some trouble to prove it. For whereas you say, *David* sinned against the clear light of his conscience, how will you make it good that this *light* of his *conscience* was so [clear] against it? *Clear light habitually*, I grant; *clear light shining actually* against it, I may deny. Alas, how doth *every passion*

paſſion, caſt a dark *damp* on the *cleareſt light*? And 2. how can you tel whether *this* might not make *David* miſtake the words of them that anſwered, *She is* Bathſheba *the daughter of* Elam, *the wife of* Uriah *the Hittite*, and take *Elam* for *Bathſheba's mother*, and *Uriah's wife*; this is not altogether *improbable*; for you know the name of the *mother* is ever and anon mentioned in ſuch caſes; and ſurely had he ſpoken of *Bathſheba* being *married*, her *husband* ſhould have been named before either *mother* or *father*. But let that paſs, and ſome other circumſtances in the Text, which may be pleaded to prove *David* eventaken at *firſt*, with an error concerning the *quality of the woman*, when you ſhall conſider, 1. How he *ſent ſervants on the meſſage to her*; and 2. *What ſervants* David *ſaid he would have in his houſe*, and you may think accordingly had: Both *he* and *they* may ſeem to have been miſtaken at *firſt*, in that he employed them, and they were ſo ready to ſerve him in ſuch a buſineſs.

Beſides,

2. For the *murther*, How can you tell that *Davids* conſcience might not be blinded, ſo far as to think he might put *what man he would upon ſuch hot ſervice*, and that he might leave him to a *ſingle encounter with the enemy*: We knew the time when ſome would have pleaded any *King* might doe *this* without offending. But clear it is, the *light* of *Davids* conſcience might be *obſcured* ſo as he might not diſcern the *unlawfulneſs of this act*, that is, not *conſider* it. *Omnis incontinens peccat ignorans*, was wont to be a common ſaying in the Moral Philoſophy Schools. So that you are concerned to evince that *David ſinned againſt the clear light of his conſcience*, and not be ſo confident we will grant it, which unleſs *we knew all the workings of* Davids *thoughts*, we are not obliged to do. Yet let that paſs.

For your Major, you only tell us, [It hath been ſufficiently argued and proved in the former Chapter, in your traverſe of the fifth Argument.] I only refer the Reader to what I have there replied; and now addreſs my ſelf to the new Argument which you produce for the further confirmation of it.

[Whoſoever is truly godly, hath by grace, a right and promiſe from God, and title to the Kingdom of God. But whoſoever commits murther, and adultery, and this againſt the light of his conſcience, during ſuch impenitency, hath no right or title to the Kingdom of God.]

I muſt tell you, this *new Argument* is but an *old one*, ſufficiently canvaſſed Chap. 12. Sect. 5. and thither I refer the Reader for a ſatisfactory anſwer. I ſhall only add this at preſent, That albeit *he* who commits ſuch ſins be not in a capacity to lay claim to the Kingdom of heaven, during his impenitency, yet during his impenitency, *Chriſt's purchaſe of repentance for him* ſtands *good*, and *he* by vertue of *this purchaſe*, hath a *claim to repentance* to be given to *this man*, in ſuch a *time* as when it ſhall make moſt for *Gods glory*.

But [Some object (ſay you) that *David* prayed unto God during his impenitency under the ſaid ſins; and that this is a ſufficient proof that he was all the while a perſon truely godly, and endued with juſtifying faith.] I do not know *who* it is that makes this *Objection* againſt you in this manner; but it is true, when your Comrades alleadg *Davids praying God to create him a new heart*, and would prove from that word *creating*, that he had *now nothing of a new heart* and grace; our Divines are wont to ſay, that that word *create*, doth not carry ſo much in it to prove *David* had *no grace*, but that *his very praying God to create*, carries a great deal *more* in it, to prove he *had grace*. But that during his *impenitency* he *prayed*, I cannot think who ſhould ſay it; ſure *this prayer* is an argument of *penitency*. Well but conſider we your Anſwer to the Objection, as you have repreſented it; it ſeems to conſiſt of no leſs then ſix ſeveral parts; but indeed three of them are neither kiſſe nor kian to the buſineſs. SECT. 3.

But 1. ſay you [It no where appears that *David* did pray unto God during the] term of his impenitency.] I believe you, ſurely no man can *pray* in *impenitency*, well he may *fall upon his knees, lift up his hands, beat his breaſts, ſtretch his lungs*, but *pray* he cannot. *Repentance* being as neceſſarily an ingredient to all *Prayers*, as *faith*. But therefore, I ſuppoſe that they who ſay *David* [*prayed during his impenitency*] if there

be any that say so, do intend but this, that *before the time of* Nathans *coming to* David, *and* David's *solemn confession* of his *sin*, and *profession* of his *repentance*, he *secretly repented*, and *craved pardon* of God. And as you say [it appears not that he prayed during the time of his impenitencie] so may I say, it appears not that he did *not pray*, and therefore *repent in private*, before his more *publique repentance* before *Nathan*. But let that pass: I come to consider what you say.

2 [Neither from one act of prayer, nor from many, can the truth or soundness of any mans faith be concluded.] Yes, if I be sure he do *truly pray*, I may conclude he doth *truly believe*; for there can be no *true prayer*, without *true faith*. It is true, I know not any mans *heart*, and so cannot be sure he doth *pray*; but take it for granted he doth *pray*, though never so *meanly*, I can infallibly conclude he doth *truly believe*, though perhaps but *weakly*. *Faith*, good Sir, is that which animates *prayer*; and as *without works faith is dead*, as wanting the proper and native attendance, so without *faith prayer is dead*, as wanting that which is *essential* unto it.

For what though [our Saviour say, *Hypocrites pray, and that often?*] he speaks *popularly*, not *accurately*, in this case. They *prayed* in the *opinion* of *men*, they did nothing less in the *sight of God*. Yea, their *long prayers* had only *shew*, not *substance*: As often as they seemed to *pray*, they never *did* pray. *Prayer* is an exercise of the *Spirit*, a humbling the *soul* in the sense of his sins and wants, a lifting up the *soul* in the confidence of Gods promises. The Pharisees *orizons* were no *prayers*; and hence it is that they were threatned with the *greater damnation*, that under a pretence of *praying* they did both *abuse Gods house*, and *devour widows houses*. *The prayer of the wicked*, that is, that which (he would have said) *men judge so*, is an *abomination to the Lord*. The more strange you should affirm, [that men may pray unto God with some degree or kind of acceptation with him, whiles they are yet but unregenerate men;] and put it upon [some of your adversaries, that they acknowledge it.] I pray what mean you by [degree or kind of acceptation?] A *temporal reward* I yield the Pharisees had, but any [degree or kind of acceptation] I deny. God gave *temporal rewards*, not out of [acceptation] of their *services*, but for a *countenancing* of that *service* which *they* only *pretended* to, and *encouragement* of others to *doe* that in *sincerity*, which they did only in *hypocrisie*. So he rewarded *Ahabs* humiliation; will you say he *accepted* it? *Without faith it is impossible to please God*; yet questionless God doth please to give *temporal rewards* to many, in whom he is far from *delighting*; and of all other punishments this is one of the saddest, to be put off with a *Verily ye have your reward*.

But 3. [It is (say you) the confession of your adversaries, that Reprobates themselves may have, and many times have some excellent gifts of the Spirit conferred upon them, and among others the gift of Prayer it self. So that could it be proved *David* did pray under his impenitencie, it cannot be inferred from hence, that therefore he was not in an estate of Reprobation.]

If [Reprobates have the gift of Prayer from the Spirit] yet I wonder which of our party saith they have the *Spirit of Prayer* with the *gift*, or that their *gift* can enable them to *pray*. Well it may to draw a *prayer*, which *others* may send up to God, *as such*; as it comes from *them*, it is nothing less. Prayer consists not in *proper expressions*, *but devout affections*; and is a work not of the *tongue*, but the *heart*. We may *pray*, when we can but *groan*; we may make *orations*, yet not *pray*. I acknowledge [*Davids* being in the Congregation, following, yea or leading the Congregation while at their devotions, doth not prove that he prayed.] But when a *Saint prays*, none knows but his *Father that sees in secret*. The *outward* act of *Prayer* doth not prove a man a *Saint*; the *inward* (which alone makes a Prayer) *doth*. But this is that which *God alone* can take cognisance of; and therefore I lay no stress upon this of [*Davids* praying in the time of his impenitencie] as you phrase it. This *praying*, as far as it is *knowable* to *men*, cannot prove him a *Saint*: but if *God* had said of him, [*that he prayed with acceptance*,] that had infallibly argued him *such*. But I know nothing the Scripture saith of his *prayers* at *this time*; and therefore I have said more then needs of it.

4. Say

4. Say you, [If *David* were a true believer during the time of his wallowing in the mire of those two foul crimes oft mentioned, then was not his washing to repentance necessary to his salvation. The reason is, because true faith gives a sufficient right and title to salvation.]

I answer, This is no more then what you said in the 2. Section, and so needs no other answer. Albeit he were a true believer *habitually*, yet was he not *actually*; not had right to enter into heaven, *till his faith wrought so* as to bring him to *repentance*. He had still *jus ad rem*, but could not have *jus in re*: But though he could not have *jus in re*, till he *repented*; yet had Christ *jus in re*, so as to challenge, according to Gods covenant, that he should be *brought in due time to repentance*, and so to *salvation*.

5. [If *David* were a true believer during the time of his departure and absence from God, then may the testimony of former and by-past works of righteousness be accepted by way of proof for the truth and soundness of any mans faith, against the testimony of latter and more present fruits of unrighteousness against it.] SECT. 4.

I am bold to deny this consequence: For there is a vast difference between many other men, and *David*. *God* had given a testimony of *Davids faith*, before these sins; and *we* conclude that therefore his *faith* was *sound*, and consequently continued notwithstanding *his sins*. Had we not had such an *immediate testimony of Gods* concerning it, we might well have had ground to *suspect it*: But we have *no such testimony* of the *faith* of multitudes of *other* men, which fall into such sins; and therefore have no reason to judge them *believers*, notwithstanding their *fair carriage before their committing such sins*. We do not judge of *Davids faith* so much by his *by-past words*, as *Gods testimony of him*; which not being to be shewed for many *others*, we may well question *their faith before such sins*, and rather suspect they had *none* because of *such sins*, notwithstanding all their [*former* and *by-past* works] of *forming righteousness*. But proceed.

[If so, then 1. No man that hath approved himself a good Christian formerly, ought upon any change whatsoever, to be judged an apostate from Christ, or consequently be upon any justifiable grounds cast out by the sentence of Excommunication, from any Church of Christ whatsoever; which supposed, no Church, duly and regularly deporting it self, in the admission of members, is in any capacity of using the said spiritual sword, in any case, upon any occasion whatsoever.]

No man can so approve *himself*, as to assure *us* of his *true faith*; and so this censure upon some unworthy carriages, may be inflicted upon him; and the Church look upon him as an apostate from his *profession*, and have too just ground to conclude, that he had never more then an *appearance* of *faith*. Yet though the Church *excommunicate* him, she may *hope* upon his *former approving* himself to her, that he may *belong* to *Christ*, notwithstanding he *deliver* him to *Satan*; as the Apostle did one for the *destruction of the flesh*, *that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord*. The *Church*, when she [proceeds most accurately in admitting of members] doth first admit *some* of whose *actual faith*, she hath not so much as *any probable assurance*, as in case of *infants*. Secondly, admits none of whose faith she hath *certain assurance*, as not being capable of diving into the secrets of any mans *heart*; and though she had as great assurance as she is capable of, yet upon such crimes she may justly proceed to *Excommunication*, not that she *rejects* him, as one not pertaining to the *election of grace*, but as one who *walks unworthy of that mercy*. Many a man belongs to the *election of grace*, that is not admitted a *member of the visible Church*, and many a man may be *cut off* from his *membership* of the *visible Church* for a *time*, and yet belong to that election; and that the Church by sentence of *excommunication*, doth not totally cut off a man from being a member of the visible Church, appears by this, that *upon repentance*, she receives him again *without rebaptizing him*. So that the *excommunication* is but a *suspension* of him from *enjoying the benefit* of some Ordinances, and it is done in *mercy*; not a *total excision of him from the Church*. *Let him be as a heathen*, it is not said *be as a heathen*. It is true, [no man who ought to be judged a true member of Christ, ought by the Church to be cut off from the body,

or

or to be delivered unto Satan] but it is as true, that every man who ought to be cut off from the body, or to be delivered unto Satan, is *not to be judged no member of Christ*. There is a main difference between *not judging a man a member of Christ*, and *judging a man not a member of Christ*.

2. Say you [The said position admitted for truth, whereas the Apostle *James* demandeth, *What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works*? he might as well, or rather have said, and *hath not had works*? For by the Tenor of the said Doctrine, though a man wants present words, or works of a later edition or performance, whereby to shew the truth of his faith unto men, yea though his later works give never so pregnant and loud a testimony against the truth of his faith, yet if he can but say, or make proof, *that formerly, though never so long before, he hath been fruitfull in well-doing*, this must be looked upon as sufficiently demonstrative of his faith.]

By your leave, I deny this; for albeit *no works* prove *no faith*, yet *some words*, whether *former*, or *later*, *do not prove faith*. *I will shew thee my faith by my works*, saith the Apostle, that is said, a *probable evidence* of it, *thou* canst not give a *probable evidence* of *faith without works*. But he doth not say *works* are a *certain evidence of faith*; but *no works* are a *certain evidence* of *no faith*; or rather *faith cannot* be any way *evidenced without works*. The intent of the Apostle was, to shew the *vanity of mens pretending faith without works*, whether *later* or *former*, for ought *I* know, or *you* do endeavor to prove.

Therefore your 3. [That in case mens former works, if good, must be heard against their later works, though never so bad, there is no place or possibility left, either for hypocrisie or apostasie among men, especially not for this later.] This I say might have been spared; for we lay not *later works* and *former* in the *ballance* in this case of *Davids*; but *Gods testimony of* Davids *faith before*, against *the testimony of* Davids *works after*; and say that this *later* doth not evince Gods testimony of *Davids faith not to have been true*; and *that being true*, his *faith* was *not to be denyed*, notwithstanding all the *Objections* made against it by his *following sins*, which only prove, a *non-operating*, not a *non-being* of his *faith*. Well but say you, to prove your inference [No man is to be judg'd an apostate, but he that declines from the faith of Jesus Christ, which sometimes he professed.] Right; but when you add, [and gave sufficient ground unto men, by his works, to conceive and judge that he really was possessed of and held.] To make him an Apostate, it is enough that he falls from the *profession* of *faith*, and that he was *before looked on as a negative Saint*, though not a *positive* one, that he *now falls from being a negative Saint*, to be a *positive enemy of the waies of holiness*; he was *formerly judged a Saint*, because he *did not appear to be other*, though he did *not appear to be a Saint*; *Qui non cognoscitur esse malus, praesumitur esse bonus*.

What you adde fourthly out of *Ezekiel*, hath been answered already, Chapter 12.

Sixthly and lastly say you, [If *Davids* repentance after the perpetration of the fall, and horrid sins mentioned, was not simply necessary to his salvation, and consequently himself, during his impenitency, a man of death, Gods sending *Nathan* to awaken him, and raise him up by repentance, will be found to have little grace, love, or mercy in it; or at least far less then such a necessity of his repentance supposed, would derive upon it.]

I answer 1. That we say *Davids repentance* was *simply necessary* to his *salvation*; only we deny that God *had not decreed to bring* David *to repentance*, and so say *we*, his repentance and salvation were both sure to be. 2. We say, *Davids* faith remained in him, and so the *seed of repentance*, notwithstanding these sins, *habitually*; nor did God, when [he raised him by repentance] *give* him a *new*, but *stir up* his *old habit of faith* to *act anew*. 3. You seem to imply as much, when you say [1. The Prophet awakened him ;] therefore say I, he was but *asleep*, not *dead*; his senses were as it were *bound up*, not *lost*; his *faith* in this *spiritual*, as his *reason* in *corporal sleep*, did *not act*, yet *not cease* to be in him. 2. The Prophet [*raised him*] as out of his *bed*, not out of his *grave*, he was at most but in a *swoone*, not *dead*; his *faith* did not *operate*, but neither did it *expire*. 4. Yet [was he a man of death] that is, *liable to*

death

death eternal [before his repentance] nor could his *conſcience* promiſe him life in *that ſtate*, the *Law condemned* him. And 5. In this reſpect doth Gods love appear in ſending *Nathan* to awaken and raiſe him, and to reduce him to ſuch a condition, as wherein he might look upon himſelf again as an *heir of heaven*: And yet if you obſerve it, *Nathan* doth not threaten him ſo much with *eternal*, as with *temporal* puniſhment: And from *theſe*, *Davids* repentance did not ſanctuary him, but it did from the *wrath to come*, whereunto he was *liable* by his *ſins*, and could not be *ſaved* from, without *repentance*.

Here you very jealouſly take care to make proviſion againſt an *Objection*, which it is, I confeſs, not *impoſſible*, but very *incredible*, that any man wearing his five ſenſes about him, ſhould ever moleſt you with. [Nor can it be ſaid (ſay you) that Gods ſending *Nathan* unto *David*, upon ſuch terms of grace, as have been mentioned, argueth any election from eternity of *David*, perſonally, or particularly conſidered, though it be true, that he doth not vouchſafe the like terms of grace, or means of repentance, unto all other ſinners.] Who I wonder concludes *Davids election* from Gods *bare ſending the Prophet to him to threaten him with judgments?* God hath done the like to many men who yet fell on the other ſide of the line of *election*. Who concludes *Davids election from* Gods *ſending his Prophet to him to call him to repentance?* He hath, I wis, ſent more Prophets then one upon the ſame errand, to many a man, whoſe *name* will not be found to have been written in any line of the *book of life?* Who concludes the election from eternity of *David*, and that perſonally, and particularly conſidered, *from Gods ſending a meſſenger to him at any time perſonally, and particularly to call him to repentance?* Your adverſaries are not ſo valiant, as to encounter you with ſuch weapons in this point of *Davids* election, nor ſo confident of their skill to raiſe ſuch a *ſtructure*, on ſuch a *foundation*; they will ſay indeed that *Davids being called*, i.e. *brought to repentance by means of this meſſengers* negotiating with him upon ſuch terms, *argueth his election from eternity*; but not *that this meſſengers calling him did ſo*: By your leave, though God doth not vouchſafe the *like terms of grace to all ſinners*: he doth it to *many*, who *never repent*, for want of *inward grace*, which unleſs *David* had had, *he* would have been as far from *repenting*, and *ſorrowing after a godly manner*, as *they*. From *Davids repenting*, we infer he had *inward grace*; from this *inward grace* we infer *his election*, and that from *eternity*; for ſure there cannot be any *new election in God*. Thus you miſerably *miſrepreſent* us in this *pretended Objection*. Let us ſee whether you doe not *anſwer it* after the ſame rate. SECT. 5.

[1. Becauſe if *David* was a true believer, and ſo in an eſtate of grace when *Nathan* came to him, he was under the wing of election, and in the way of life and ſalvation, and conſequently his ſending to him by God, did neither argue *pro* or *con*, ſuch his election.]

1. I reply, That it is no great fault in the Argument, *being to prove* Davids *election*, that it ſaith nothing *againſt it*; ſo that this [*pro* and *con*] is I know not what.

2. That though [*David* were a true believer, and under the wing of election (as you phraſe it) when *Nathan* came to him;] yet *that* notwithſtanding *Nathans coming*, might *argue for his election*, though I think no body ſaith it doth; nay if *any thing argue a mans election*, he muſt be confeſt *under the wing of election*, and a *believer before that argue him ſo*; whatever *argues him ſo*, *arguing him ſo only* a poſteriori.

2. Say you, [There might be ſome equitable conſideration on *Davids* behalf, though not known to us, on which God might ground a diſpenſation of more grace and mercy towards *him*, then other ſinners.

3. In caſe there ſhould be found any other ſins whatſoever, like unto *David*, in all circumſtances relating unto ſin and righteouſneſs, it is little queſtionable, but that in like caſe of guilt, and preſent impeniteney, means of like grace and efficacy, though not literally, or formally the ſame, would be vouchſafed unto him.]

All this is without book; for *we* deny any ſuch [equitable conſideration on *Davids* part,] and look upon him according to your ground as *deſerving* ſo much *harder*

meaſure

measure, as he had had *more means* to have *avoided*, and ſhould accordingly have more *abhorred* theſe ſins, then another.

And to your 3. What [equitable conſideration] could there be I pray on *Pauls* part, why Chriſt ſhould cal to *him* from heaven, more then *another?* God *gives means of grace* to thoſe, who of all others might *expect them leſs*, and *withholds* them from thoſe who are *guilty of leſs ſins*, meerly to ſhew his own *abſolute ſoveraignty*, and that he *diſpenſpenſeth theſe means* meerly *according to the Councel of his own will*.

In concluſion, as to this caſe of *Davids*, we ſay, 1. That *you* have not proved by all you have ſaid, that *David was totally fallen from the favour of God by his ſins*; for it is clear, God *out of favour ſent* him *Nathan*, and *bleſſed Nathans* coming to him, and *both in favour*.

2. That as little have you proved, *that* David *was totally fallen from grace*, for *his repenting* ſhews he had *grace left*; that though *We* cannot ſhew how *his grace wrought during his impenitency*, yet his *repentance* ſhews it was *not totally loſt*: *Nathan* did but *charge David*, and *David confeſſeth his ſin to Nathan*, and *Nathan abſolves him*; *The Lord hath put away thy ſin*.

SECT. 6. You proceed to that of *Solomon*, in whom you pretend [to find a ſad inſtance of a total recidivation from grace or true faith.] That [*Solomon before his Idolatry*, was a *true believer*] is yielded you; the teſtimony which the Scripture gives of *Gods love to him*, of *his love to God*, ſufficiently evinceth it. That [*Solomon* ſinned at a high rate of wickedneſs] is more uncapable of denyal; yet withall the holy Ghoſt intimates, that which gives us ground to deny him guilty of [a total apoſtaſie:] true, it is ſaid [*His heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as was the heart of* David *his Father*] but that it is ſaid, *not to have been perfect*, ſhews it was *not altogether perverted*; that it is ſaid, *not to have been perfect as was the heart of* David *his father*, ſhews it was *not ſo perverted*, but that it was *better* then *many other Kings*, though *worſe* then *his father Davids*. That it is ſaid that [*he did that which was evil in the ſight of the Lord, and went not fully after the Lord, as did* David *his father*,] ſhews that he did *not ſo much evil*, but that *he went after the Lord*, though *not fully, nor as* David *his father*. That [his heart was turned from the Lord God of *Iſrael*] ſhews not that it was *turned quite away*; nor doth [Gods anger] ſhew a [total rejection of him] yea *his return unto God*, which your ſelf are content to grant, ſhews that [God turned not away his love from him notwithſtanding his anger.] It was *Gods love to Solomon*, that *turned Solomon back again to God*. Nay though it be ſaid [his heart was turned away from the Lord God of Iſrael, ſo that he went after *Chemoſh*, and the abomination of *Moab*, *Molech*, and *Milchom*, &c.] yet that he worſhipped either of theſe, is not ſaid: his *toleration of others* to worſhip them, (I pray take eſpecial notice of it) is charged on him as if he had done therein what is equivalent to *worſhipping*: *He built Altars to them for his wives*, I do not find he did for *himſelf*; but his *connivance*, yea *countenancing* of *their Idolatry*, is cenſured as *an actual committing of it* in his own *perſon*. So little reaſon have you to be too forward, in being your ſelf a *Proctor*, and perſwading thoſe who have power, to be *permitters*, of either the *worſhip of falſe Gods*, or *the falſe worſhip of the true God*. So that notwithſtanding all that is or can be objected againſt *Solomon*, I do not find but that ſtill he may be acknowledged to have retained ſome *ſeed* of the *fear of God*, and God muſt be confeſſed to have *retained his favour to him*, in regard of his *purpoſe* to *reduce him to repentance*; and we may well conceive that to be true of *him*, which *David* his father ſaith of a *righteous man*, though *he fall, he ſhall not be caſt down, for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand*.

SECT. 7. I come to examin what you object againſt this which is pleaded to this purpoſe, from Gods promiſe unto *David* in the behalf of *Solomon*. *I will be his father, and he ſhall be my ſon; If he commit iniquity, I will chaſten him*, &c. *but my mercy ſhall not depart from him, as I took it from* Saul. 2 *Sam.* 7. 14, 15.

I am content to yield you that [this mercy is ſpoken of continuing to him the Kingdom of *Judah*.] But then 1. I would fain know whether Gods promiſe *to be a father to him*, doth not carry a *ſpiritual bleſſing with it*; ſhew me where God ever ſtiles himſelf a *father* to any but his *elect*, or where he cals *others his ſons*. 2. For the *mer-*

cy

cy to Saul, though *that were taken away*, and were but *in temporal things*; yet it follows not that *no other mercy was intended to Solomon*: It is no unusual thing in Scripture, in the same period, to speak both of *temporal* and *spiritual* things, under the *same* word, *I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine*, viz. corporal, *till I drink it*, viz. spiritual, *in my Fathers Kingdom*. So here *my mercy*, viz. in spiritual things, as well as temporal, *I will not take from him*, Solomon, as I took it, *viz. temporal*, or at least *only spiritual of a lower rank*, from *Saul*.

And though I lay no great weight on that *Eccl.* 2.9. where *Solomon* saith of himself, *also his wisdom remained with him*, yet may I well enough affirm, *that his wisdom even spiritual*, might remain in *semine*, even when he yielded little other then *fruits of folly*. We see a wise man, even when he is seized on, by either a frenzie or lethargie, yet loseth not the *habit* of his *wisdom*, more then the *fancy* of his *reason*; but these distempers being *over*, he acts again immediately as it becomes him, which argues the *habit* not to have been *lost*. So nothing hinders but that in the midst of *Solomons* greatest *extravagancies*, the *seeds* of his *spiritual wisdom remained in him*, which is as much as we use to contend for. And yet there are wise men, who think we need not trouble our selves much about him, but may be content to leave him hanging between heaven and hell, and learn this from him, that *no wisdom* is sufficient to keep a man from the most *horrible provocations*, without the *continual assistance* of the *spirit of grace*; we desire rather *to work out our own salvation with an humble fear*, then to misspend our time in an over-confident defending of *Solomon*: *his fal* we are sure of, not so sure of either his *regeneration at first*, or *repentance at last*. It concerns us the more to look to *our own standing*. SECT. 8.

You come to New-Testament Examples, and first you tell us of those that having put away a good conscience concerning faith made shipwrack. 1 *Tim.* 1. 19. then of *Hymenem* and *Philetus* who destroyed the faith of some. 2 *Tim.* 2.17. and lastly of some who were then turned aside after Satan. 1 *Tim.* 5. 15. SECT. 9.

1. Those [who by *putting away a good conscience, made shipwrack of faith, must* say you, be supposed 1. to have had *true faith*, 2. to have utterly lost it.] I am content to yield all; take *faith* for the *doctrine of faith*, and the *profession* of it, a *hypocritical profession* of the *true doctrine of faith*. Nor do I see that you alleadg ought against this sense of the words, though it be that which is commonly given by our Divines, that this is to be understood not of the *habit*, but *nature* of faith beyond all conscience.

But first you trouble your self unnecessarily about [a good conscience] and dispute that a man cannot have it without true faith] you must mean the habit; to which I need say but this, That those men might *never have a good conscience*, yet *put it away*; as I may *put away* that which is *coming towards me*, though it never *lighted upon me*. The *doctrine of faith*, which they had learned, had they not hindred the operation of it, was of such a tendency and import, as to have *purified their hearts* and *consciences*; but they having *put away a good conscience*, *made shipwrack concerning this faith*, i. e. *this Doctrine*, which else would have *purged their consciences*, had they not desperately abandoned *all conscience*. Nor need we wonder that the Apostle saith, *they put away a good conscience*, albeit they *never had a good conscience*, for they were *hoped* to have had *a good conscience*, but now were *known* to have *none*; and though it was the *judgment of charity*, that they had a *good conscience*, because they appeared not *to have a bad*, but now a *judgment of certainty* that they had *abandoned a good conscience*, as well as *faith*. SECT. 10. 11.

2. You dispute as industriously against the counterfeitness of this faith concerning which they made shipwrack; but I wis I yield it was *true faith*, as to the *Doctrine*, or *fides qua*, not as to the *habit*, or *fides qua*. They held the *same Doctrine* with *Timothy* and *Lois*, they held it not with the *like hand of faith*. SECT. 12.

Yet I confess this line of interpretation is not to be cast over the other Scripture, 2 *Tim.* 2. 18. where *Hymeneus* and *Philetus* are said to have *overthrown the faith of some*; this faith is indeed to be understood of the *habit of faith*; *but* then it was but such as is called *temporary*, not *a sound and lively faith*; and I yield that *their word did creep like a Gangrene*, and would have *endangered* the *faith of sound believers*, had they not been *preserved* by the *cutting off* of these *corrupt* and *rotten members*, SECT. 13.

Hymeneus and *Philetus*. But that the *ſound believers* were *all ſaved from this danger*, abundantly appears by what follows, *nevertheleſs the foundation of God ſtandeth ſure, having this ſeal, The Lord knows them that are his, and let every one that nameth the name of Chriſt, depart from iniquity.* For the clearing whereof I ſhall endeavour to open this Text; wherein we are to conſider 1. what is meant by the foundation of the Lord; 2. what by its ſtanding ſure; 3. what by the Seal which it hath.

1. The *Foundation* may be taken either in the *Builders*, or elſe in the *Lawyers* ſenſe. It ſeems not to be taken in the *Builders* ſenſe, becauſe ſo *foundations* have no Seals; but if we remember that the *foundation* in the Revelation had an *Inſcription* on it, *Rev.* 20. Next that, *Darius* put a *Seal on a ſtone*, *Dan.* 6. 17. and ſo *Pilates* Officers, *Matth.* 27. 66. This will not be ſo *abſurd*; yet let it be taken in the *Lawyers* ſenſe, as it is 1 *Tim.* 6. *Laying up a good foundation*, that is, *evidence*; *Foundation* among the Hebrews being the *Writings* which *Lawyers* produce, as that *foundation* whereon to raiſe their *pleadings*: And ſo it here ſignifies the *Covenant of God* made with Chriſt for his Elect.

2. This *Foundation ſtandeth ſure*, or *hath ſtood ſure*, the *præter* tenſe being of that ſenſe, as to include *all* in this place, i. e. *it hath ever*, notwithſtanding all oppoſition, and ſo *doth*, and ever *will* ſtand ſure in *it ſelf*. A *good mans Covenant*, whether it have a *Seal* or *no*, ſtands *ſure* in *this* ſenſe, much more *Gods*; but for *clearing the ſureneſs* of it, *we* uſe to put *Seals*; ſo accordingly doth *God* vouchſafe as it were to condeſcend to our frailty.

3. This Seal is that which follows, having, as all *great Seals* an *inſcription*; and as the *Great Seal of Princes* hath uſually an *Inſcription on both ſides*, one in reference to the *Prince*, another to the *People*, ſo hath this; *one* in reference to *God* and his *pleaſure*, *The Lord knows who are his*; another in reference to *his people* and *their duty*, *Let every one that nameth the name of Chriſt, depart from iniquity.*

1. The *Lord knows them that are his.* 1. If *all* were *his*, he need not ſay, *them that are his.* All are his by *Creation*, general preſervation, and protection; but *theſe* are ſuppoſed to be *his* by an *eſpecial relation*; *his* 1. by election, 2. by vocation, 3. by adoption, &c. *The Lord as Lord* hath a juſt claim to *all* as *his*, *all creatures* as well as *men*, *all men* as well as *his children*; but *theſe* as *Lord* he choſe to be *his* more eſpecially: *All the veſſels in a houſe* are the *Lords*, but *ſome* are *his* for his *own* more *eſpecial uſe*; ſo theſe.

2. *The Lord knows them* accordingly, that is, not only in *generall*, ſo he knows *all creatures*, hath *every veſſel* upon his *inventory*, as it were; but in *particular*, ſo as he doth the *way of the righteous*, knows *all* their *perſons*, ſo as to take ſpecial *care of them*; *all* their *actions*, *words* and *thoughts*, ſo as to *guide them*; *all* their *wants* ſo as to relieve, and *dangers*, ſo as to prevent them; *all* their *ſins*, ſo as to *heal their backſlidings.*

2. *Let every one that nameth the name of Chriſt depart from iniquity.* It is *in Chriſt* alone that any are *the Lords* in this *eſpecial manner*: But now ſome *name Chriſt* only, but truſt not in him; others are *named by Chriſt*; ὀνομαζόμενος may be taken *paſſively* as well as *actively*: *all* are to *depart from iniquity*; but *thoſe* who are *truly Chriſts* more *eſpecially* do it, elſe in vain *name* they Chriſt in *prayer.* The Apoſtle then aims at *this*; that albeit the faith of *ſome*, who had but a *temporary faith*, were deſtroyed by *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, as who were only ſuch as had *Chriſt named on them*, or *called upon Chriſts name*, but not *ſincerely*; yet *none* who *were truly the Lords*, did, or could be overthrown.

I yield, [the Apoſtle uſeth theſe words as an anſwer to an objection apt to be made by the fear of believers:] They were ready to object, that they were in danger of falling off, as *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, and others, whom they looked upon as better then themſelves. The Apoſtles anſwer *no*, if they did *truly believe*; for that though *they did fail, God could not*; *He abideth faithfull, and cannot deny himſelf*, v. 13. *His foundation ſtands ſure*, that is, *his covenant with Chriſt*; and you have a *ſeal of it*, in that your hearts tell you *you depart from iniquity.* He who *gave you hearts to depart from iniquity*, will ſtill *keep your hearts from iniquity*; and though you have an

unhappy

unhappy mixture of *infidelity*, yet *keep your faith* that it ſhall not *fail*, nor *you periſh*. You are *veſſels fitted for the Maſters uſe*; and though but of *wood* or *ſtone*, yet being *kept clean by him* for *his own table*, you are *his* in a more eſpecial manner; and being ordained for *his own table*, you ſhall be *kept clean*; ſo that you ſhall never be caſt away.

So that this Text, 1. By way of Antitheſis intimates *what manner of perſons* they were *whoſe faith was deſtroyed*, viz. ſuch as did not *depart from iniquity*, and conſequently ſuch as were *not the Lords* in an *eſpecial manner*. 2. Shews the *impoſſibility of the falling away* of ſuch as are *the Lords* in an *eſpecial manner*, by vertue of *that covenant* which was made with Chriſt from all eternity. *The foundation of the Lord ſtandeth ſure, &c.* You acknowledge that [there is an Antitheſis in thoſe words, *Sect.* 14. and that they are an anſwer to an objection] of the ſame import with that that I have repreſented; and agree with me in ſundry other particulars delivered in the explication of this Scripture; only *you* make [the Apoſtle to aſſert nothing more then the ſtability of the truth of God in the Goſpel in generall, to all that believe, and depart from iniquity.] But ſay *I*, the Apoſtle intends to ſhew much *more*, that *true believers, and ſuch as depart from iniquity, ſhall be kept by the power of God from returning to iniquity*. Elſe the comfort which he adminiſters, is too narrow to cover the ſore. The objection will ſtill ſtand true, God will keep us while we believe; but alas how know we how ſoon we may be drawn aſide from our belief, and ſo loſe our intereſt in the promiſes, Gods faithfulneſs notwithſtanding? If we *ceaſe* to *believe*, we are *ſure* to be *loſt*. This objection receives no ſatisfaction, but by *ſuch a ſenſe* as I have delivered, *that God in his faithfulneſs will keep them in faith*; *He begun*, and he will *finiſh their faith*: He cannot forget his covenant with his Son; they may be ſure they are in an *eſpecial manner* within that covenant; ſome of that bleſſed number for whom Chriſt purchaſed faith, and repentance, and perſeverance, in order to *ſalvation*. Nothing leſs then *this* can ſalve the *ſcruple*, to which you confeſs theſe words are applied. And thus the Election of ſome particular perſons, and more their Perſeverance, hath an eminent intereſt in this Metaphor, and alſo in the Contexr: and the *firm ſtanding of thoſe which are the Lords*, by *vertue of the foundation*, ſhews that *thoſe who fell were not the Lords* in this *eſpecial manner*; and though they proved guilty of *true Apoſtaſie*, they were never more then *Pretenders to faith*.

Nor do I think you will in haſte bring any man to make *affidavit* for *S. Judas* his holineſs, as many good men and true as you & *Lorinus* have at hand to ſay ſomwhat in his behalf. They will be all afraid of ſpeaking too confidently of him, (though they do not lay their hand upon the book) as ſoon as they caſt their eye on the place *John* 6. 70. where Chriſt called him *Devil*, a conſiderable time before he diſcovered himſelf to be a *Traitor*. *Chryſoſtome* may be allowed to look upon *Judas* as one that carried himſelf fairly at the time that Chriſt ſpake to his Diſciples, *Ye which have followed me in the Regeneration*: For the *Diſciples* had as good an opinion of him a long time *after*; and that [he was in a capacity of being ſaved] though ſomwhat remote, *we* yield too; ſure *nearer* then the *Devil* that *entred into him*. But that ever he was qualified with *ſuch a faith*, as to qualifie him for *ſalvation*, appears not by all you and *Lorinus* have to adde to *Chryſoſtoms* word for him. SECT. 15.

1. Chriſt in ſpeaking of *twelve thrones whereon* he ſaith *his Diſciples ſhall ſit*, muſt be acknowledged to ſpeak ſo as to need an interpreter; for elſe you muſt conclude *Judas doth ſit upon a throne*, if Chriſt ſpeak of *him* as well as the *reſt*.

2. Chriſt in ſpeaking ſo, muſt be interpreted in ſuch a way as may beſt ſalve the truth, and honour of his ſpeech. But this is better done by *denying Judas* to have *followed Chriſt in the Regeneration*, otherwiſe then in *ſhew* and *formality*, and ſo this ſpeech not to concern *Judas*; then by ſaying *Judas then followed Chriſt in the Regeneration*, but *afterward* degenerated and forſook him: For Chriſt ſpeaks of them that *have followed him in the Regeneration*, whom he intended to preſerve from *forſaking him*.

3. Chriſt ſpeaks not of the Twelve, for ought appears by the Evangeliſt, as you ſpeak. For *Lorinus*, He doth not ſay more then that it is *probabilis opinio* that

Iudas cum electus est, viz. *in Apostolum, bonus fuerit.* There are many degrees of *bonus*, which will fall short of bringing men within compass of *salvation*, yea or *faith*. And the signs which are given of *Iudas* his being *bonus*, are such as will not hold to make it out to us.

1. That when *Mary Magdalen* first anointed Christs feet, *Iudas murmurasse non legitur, quia nondum fuit avarus.* 1. *Non legitur* will not prove *non murmurasse.* 2. *Non murmurasse* will as little prove that *nondum fuit avarus.* 3. His question presently after, *What need this waste?* makes more against him, then *non legitur* doth for him. And 4. *This he spake, not because he loved the poor, but was a thief, and bore the bag*, makes it needless for me to speak more against you or others good opinion of his integrity.

2. That *Anastasius Nicenus* saith *he did miracles*, will not without less then a miracle convince any man of his *goodness*. We know who shall talk of the like miracles done by them in Christs name, yet be answered by Christ, *I never knew you.*

3. That *Olympiodorus* saith *he converted many*, doth as little turn my thoughts to a better opinion of his goodness. 1. It is said without book, that he *converted any.* 2. His *converting* of *others* proves not he was *converted himself.*

4. His *casting out of the Devil*, could it be made good, would not evince him to have been a child of God. Shortly, *his being entrusted with the bag*, is as far from proving his having any true heavenly treasure. *Lorinus* hath taken much pains to produce such evidences for *Iudas* his Saintship, which may be answered with as much ease; and he at last comes off with a Confession of *Austin*, *Scio existimari esse in contraria sententia in multis locis:* And adds, that *aliqui levioris notæ*, are *fortasse* of the same mind. But he passeth by them as lightly, as I have done him. And though I do not insist upon *Iudas* his sins *before his calling by Christ*, yet I do on those *after it*, to prove him to have been called only *outwardly*, and endued with no other graces then such as would never bring him to *glory.*

As for [*Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, their being admitted members of the Church, proves them not true Saints. The Reader may please to have recourse to *Sect.* 4. their Excommunication proves them not to have been final Apostates, *vid. ibid.* yet such I am very well pleased to yield them, *feigned Believers* from the *beginning*, *true Apostates* to the *end*; that proves not that *true Saints shall ever be left by God so to apostatize.*

SECT. 16. The same we say of all such of the *Galatians* as apostatized finally; that notwithstanding they were removed *from him that called them unto grace*, they were not removed *from an effectual calling by grace* to *another Gospel.* Some who *received the Spirit of grace*, might be removed for a *time*, yet be *recovered* again; and that they were not, you have not proved. Their *receiving of* Paul *as an Angel of God*, and *suffering many things for the Gospel*, proves not a *receiving Christ* as their *onely Reconciler* unto God, nor their *resolution to suffer all* that should befall them for his sake, out of an apprehension of *his incomparable excellencie* above all other things. But why must you needs produce [*Paul's* being *afraid of them lest he should have bestowed labour on them in vain*, Chap. 4. 11.] as an argument they had *true* and *saving* faith? I had thought he *had bestowed labour on them in vain*, as well, if notwithstanding all his labours they *attained not to true faith*, as if they *lost it* having *once attained to it.* And yet why might [he not be *afraid they would lose or make shipwrack of an unsound, light, hypocritical faith?*] Their faith which as for their *assent* was *light, unsound*, as for the *matter* was true and solid. He might well fear their *leaving sound truths solidly taught them*, though but *slightly learned by them*, for such vapouring new-nothing Notions, as many then, and some at least now, are content to feed on. All this, and that which follows, relates meerly to the *doctrine*, not the *habit* of faith. [Ye who are justified by the Law, that is, who pretend you are justified by the Law] for sure none who were *really justified* by it *are fallen from grace*, v. the *Doctrine* of *Free-grace*, which you pretended formerly to embrace as *truth*, and the *comfort* or *benefit* which you might expect in that way. [Who did hinder you, that you should not obey the truth] sounds but so much; and the passage, [*Ye did run well*] goes not a foot further.

Nor

Nor doth your old friend [*Muſculus* his Comment] ſay more; [his *vera fide*] being by him ſufficiently expounded [*à religione Chriſti*] The *Doctrine* is that alone which he means by it. And now what if he add, [*Significat, eos potuiſſe ad vera felicitatis ac ſalutis metam pertingere, ſi in eo quod bene coeperant perſeverâſſent*] There was, I hope, a *poſſibility* of their being ſaved in the *true religion*; he doth not ſay they *ſhould have been, had they continued in the true religion.* They *could not be ſaved out of it*, they might *periſh in it*, unleſs they *truly embraced* and *acted* according to the *doctrine or religion* which they *profeſſed.* Again, *Muſculus* his *principia fidei* ſhews clearly what faith it is whence he ſaith they fell; the *principles* or *doctrine* of *true faith*, not a *true faith* in thoſe *principles.*

Calvin indeed ſaith, *They fell not only from the doctrine of Chriſt, but from Chriſt himſelf.* But for this paſſage of *Calvin's*, I deſire the Reader to have recourſe to my anſwer to your 19 *Sect.* of your 15 *Chapter*, where you quote it again in more ſtate, and I have anſwered it (for I did that piece before this) as largely and fully. And ſo *Muſculus* his next piece, [*Ye are tranſplanted from Chriſt*] will be content with the ſame ſenſe, from the *profeſſion of his doctrine*, from being members of his Church *profeſſing the truth*, from the *benefit* of all ſuch members.

Luther, it is as clear, ſpeaks but of the *truth of doctrine* and *viſible Church.* 1. *à veritate cui antea obedierant*; and *obedieram* doth not preſently ſignifie more then an outward obedience. 2. *Non amplius eſtis in regno gratiæ: Regnum gratiæ*, I trow, is a title which you will be content to allow to the viſible Church.

You conclude your Chapter with a ſecond [ſurvey of 1 *Tim.* 5. 15. *Some are already turned aſide after Satan.* And *Calvin's* Comment upon them in theſe words: *Poſt Satanam, notanda loquutio, quia nemo poteſt vel tantillum à Chriſto deflectere, quin Satanam ſequitur; nam regnum in omnes habet, qui Chriſti non ſunt. Hinc admonemur quam exitialis ſit deflexio a recto curſu, qua ex Dei filiis nos facit Satanæ mancipia.* So that his ſenſe upon the place clearly is, That the perſons here ſaid to have turned aſide after Satan, were before this their turning aſide the children of God, and therefore true believers; and that by means of their turning aſide, and after it, they were the ſlaves of the Devil, which implies a total defection at leaſt from Chriſt and their faith.] SECT. 17.

1. *Calvin* ſaith, *Nemo poteſt vel tantillum à Chriſto deflectere*: No man can turn aſide from Chriſt, though never ſo little, but he follows Satan. Do you never *turn aſide from Chriſt?* (O happy man!) and therein *follow after Satan?* Yet I trow you are not preſently a *ſlave of Satan*; (O miſerable!)

2. Therefore *Calvin's deflectere* muſt not be rendred by a *bare*, but a *wilfull* turning aſide.

3. And men may thus wilfully turn aſide from the doctrine of Chriſt, who never followed that doctrine in their converſation: We will yield a total defection of theſe your holy men; we deny they were ever guilty of more then a partial following of Chriſt; though they made profeſſion *of* the truth, they did it not *in* truth.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

In Answer to Chapter 15. *of Mr.* Goodwins *Book, the last of his Digression.*



Am now arrived at the Chapter wherein Mr. *Goodwin* displayeth the glory of his Reading with as much pomp, as he hath hitherto done that of his Reasoning; and I doubt not with like happy success.

And first he gravely tels us of a certain odd [Vanity whereunto the tongues and pens of Learned men are usually subject, to create undeserved prejudice to all such Doctrines and Opinions as they oppose; and to this purpose, if they can find such Doctrines and opinions, either held by some whose lot it hath been to be voted Hereticks, gainsaid by others, whose better luck it hath been to be honoured with the stile of Orthodox, to use the names of men as arguments against those Doctrines, pretending them to be embraced only by persons infamous for error; but rejected by such as have been of fairer and clearer reputation in the Church.]

I yield him that the opposition of *some* men in most points Orthodox, and the attestation of *others* in most points erroneous, is indeed no *convincing argument* of the *falshood* of any Doctrine; the most *Orthodox* men being not priviledged from *all error*, nor the most *erroneous* deprived of the sight of *some truth*; the most *erroneous* being so happy now and then as to see some *truth* which *Orthodox* men doe not; and the most *Orthodox* so unfortunate as to slip into some *mistakes*, which persons for the most part *erroneous* may chance to avoid. But, though the dissent of men Orthodox in the general, and assent of men notoriously erroneous, be not to be ranked among Arguments *convincing*, yet may they well be allowed a plea among such as are *perswading*; and though they prevail not with us to *crie down such Doctrines*, yet they may well induce us to forbear *crying them up*, and keep us from being too forward to afford them *entertainment*, albeit our jealousie break not out into a *quarrel* with those whose facility pleaseth to be more kind to them. Well the *names of men* may make us suspicious of the *nature* of a *Doctrine*; and so much reverence we owe to those who deservedly bear the title of *Orthodox*, as to set a *mark* on that Doctrine whereon they set a *brand*; and so much care I think we owe to *our selves*, as to beware how we trust those Doctrines too far, which we find as it were in the bosoms of those who are known *enemies to the truth of God*. It is a signe of *little good*, that they are so great with *ill Authors*, who use not to *countenance*, much less *contend* for any Doctrine, but which they hope to render one way or other serviceable to their main designe, to which *no truth*, as *truth*, will ever yield to *contribute*.

2. Albeit here and there the most *Orthodox* man may think *ill* of a *truth*, and the most *erroneous* be content to *maintain* it; yet neither are the *generality* of the *Orthodox* wont to *combine against a truth*, nor the *generality* of *erroneous* men to agree in the *favouring* and *protecting it*.

Now few [Learned mens tongues and pens] are guilty of so much vanity as to dip themselves too deeply in the *censure* of a Doctrine, upon the *credit* of *one single* Orthodox man who hath *gainsaid it* meerly upon this account, that *one single heretick* hath *asserted* it; but where the *generality* of the *Orthodox* are for the *negative*, and that

that of *erroneous* men for the *affirmative*, it is far from being a [vanity in the tongues and pens of Learned men] to engage with the *Orthodox*, againſt the *erroneous*; which is the caſe in the buſineſs in hand.

3. Nor do [the tongues or pens of the Learned] on *our* ſide, *miſtake* the Doctrine which they oppoſe, as oppoſed by the Orthodox, and aſſerted by the erroneous, and in the ſtead of it take *another* [reſembling it only in ſome outward lineaments, though in heart and ſubſtance altogether differing from it;] but it is the *ſame Doctrine* that *Auſtin* and the Church *oppoſed*, and *Pelagius* and his followers *ſtickled* for, that they diſpute againſt in this caſe, as ſhall appear in the proceſs.

In the mean time, though the Point under debate be that of *Perſeverance*, you pleaſe to inſtance in the Doctrine of *Election* and *Predeſtination unto life from foreſeen faith or works*; and this, though it be an *impertinency*, yet ſhall not be called a *vanity* whereto your Pen is frequently addicted; only I ſhall ſay this, you do even *wilfully miſtake the point*, while you ſeverely tax others for *miſtaking unwittingly*. But I ſuppoſe you inſtanced in the Doctrine of *election from foreſeen faith or works*, to ſhew [the Learned tongues and perſons] of *our* ſide, miſtake in *other* points, as well as *that* of *Perſeverance*, pretending they oppoſe the Doctrine *oppoſed* by *Auſtin*, and *defended* by *Pelagius*, when as indeed this Doctrine which [the Learned tongues and pens] oppoſe, only *reſembles* that oppoſed by *Auſtin*, and defended by *Pelagius* [in ſome outward lineaments, but hath nothing like it but the face] which alſo is put upon it quite againſt its *heart*.

[It is evident (ſay you) from the Records of Antiquity, that the Opinion concerning *Predeſtination from foreſeen faith or works*, which was held by the *Pelagians*, and rejected by the Orthodox Fathers, was not ſimply this, that God predeſtinated thoſe unto life, whom he foreſaw would believe, or live holily; but whom he foreſaw would believe, or live holily out of the ſtrength or abilities of nature. The Orthodox Fathers themſelves held and taught Predeſtination from foreſeen faith and holineſs, as well as the *Pelagians*; but with this difference, The Fathers taught it from the foreſight of ſuch a faith and holineſs which men ſhould be enabled unto by *grace*, the *Pelagians* from ſuch, whether faith or holineſs, which men ſhould raiſe, or exhibit by the ſtrength of *Nature*.]

I anſwer, That the Fathers indeed acknowledged Predeſtination unto *glory* to be *ex*; or rather *cum præſcientia fidei, & perſeverantia*; and ſo I think doe [the Learned tongues and pens] which are pleaſed to oppoſe you in your way; but the queſtion between the Fathers and the *Pelagians*, was about Predeſtination unto *grace*; whether faith and perſeverance were not the *effects* of predeſtination, rather then the *cauſe* of it? The *Pelagians* affirmed them to be the *cauſe* of Predeſtination, the Fathers to be the *effects* of it; the *Pelagians* affirmed Predeſtination to *depend*, as you quote it out of *Voſſius*, *Wholly upon mans part*, *Prædeſtinationis cauſam dari ex parte hominis ſecundum omnes effectus*; *At Catholici ergo noverunt gratiam primam, non ex merito, ſed gratis conferri; quare nec putarunt, ex parte hominis, cauſam dari Prædeſtinationis ad gratiam Prævenientem.* And in this they differed from the *Pelagians*, and are followed by [the Learned tongues and pens] which you charge with miſtaking *them* and the *Pelagians*. I pray which of thoſe [Learned tongues and pens] deny firſt or ſecond, *That God predeſtinated men to glory, as a reward of faith and perſeverance which he foreſaw: That God foreſaw every mans faith and perſeverance, whom he predeſtinated to glory.*

Whether *in ſigno rationis*, God predeſtinated men, *firſt* to *glory*, and *then* to *faith* and *repentance* as a *means*; or *firſt* to *faith* and *repentance*, and *then* to *glory* as a *reward* of it; or whether he predeſtinated men to *glory*, and *faith* and *repentance* as a *conjunct means* to that *principal end*, the manifeſting of the glory of his *mercy* in *ſome*, and *juſtice* on *others*, is indeed diſputed among our Divines, but as Dr. *Twiſs* rightly and ingeniouſly, theſe points are diſcuſſed meerly as *apices logici*; all agree in the point which is properly Theological; that *God predeſtinated none to glory, but whom he foreſaw would believe and perſevere, he predeſtinating them to belief and perſeverance*, to be conferred upon them in *order* to *their glory*; as well as *glory* to be conferred

upon

upon them as a *reward* of their *faith* and *perſeverance* whereto he predeſtinated them. There is no diſpute among us concerning this; nor yet may the *Pelagians* ſay, *we* agree with *them* more then that *they* agree with the *Fathers*. The point in queſtion between them, was about predeſtination unto *grace* affirmed by the *Fathers*, denied by the *Pelagians*. For the reſt [the Learned tongues and pens] you wot of, *agree* with the *Pelagians* in it; and therefore ſure do not *tax* the *Pelagians* for *differing* from the Fathers, in *that* wherein *themſelves agree* with the *Pelagians*. And *Voſſius*, if you pleaſe to obſerve it, drives at *this*, to take off the *Pelagians* from a pretence that *they differed not from the Orthodox Fathers*, forſooth, becauſe they *agreed with them thus far*. He ſaith nothing to blemiſh the [Learned tongues and pens] which you ſnap at, as if they miſtook the *Pelagians*, and either charged the *Pelagians* with *differency* from the Fathers in ought wherein indeed they *agreed*, or *differed* from the *Pelagians* in ought wherein the *Pelagians agreed* with the Fathers.

But why of all men living, ſhould *you* be ſo ready to tax theſe [Learned tongues and pens] for miſtaking the *Pelagians* in this particular of Predeſtination to life from foreſeen faith and perſeverance, when *your ſelf* have 1. No mind to acknowledg either any Predeſtination at all of *any particular man*, either to *grace* or *glory*. And 2. No heart to acknowledg as much as any *foreknowledg in God*, *you* who deny both his *Predeſtination* of *particular perſons*, and *Preſcience* of *future events*, need not be ſo *touchy* with *us*; did we deny *predeſtination upon the foreknowledg of faith and perſeverance*? nor ſo *zealous* for the *Pelagians*, as to maintain *they* affirmed no more in affirming it, then the Orthodox Fathers did.

Surely you ſeem to have had no other aim in this, but meerly either 1. to create a prejudice againſt thoſe [Learned tongues and pens] which are drawn againſt your opinion in the point of *Perſeverance*; as if poor things, they as little reached your meaning *in this point*, as they did the *Pelagians* in that of *Predeſtination out of foreſeen faith and works*, wherein they have been ſo ſhamefully at a fault. Or elſe perhaps 2. To ſhew that albeit you be not for predeſtination of particular men, or Gods *foreknowledg* of their *faith* and *perſeverance*; yet you would ſeem to be for *faith* and *perſeverance*, their being from the *infuſion* of *grace*, not the *abilities* of *nature*; but you are even in this particular all as groſs as any *Pelagians*; they were content to call *nature*, *grace*; and *you* put but *ſuch grace* as we may well enough, without diſhonour to it, call *nature*, it being *equally* derived to *all* the ſons and daughters of men in their *firſt coming into the world*, and *all being qualified in their firſt entrance*, with *power enough to believe* even without any other Preacher calling them, then thoſe dumb ones, *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*.

But ſure whatever your deſigne was, *you* that profeſs to be [of a ſenſe or opinion, in the point of Predeſtination differing from the generality of Orthodox Antiquity] doe not here alleadg the Ancients as if you *valued their judgments* in the point of Perſeverance, but only to ſhew the [*vanity of the tongues and pens*] of ſuch as for quietneſs ſake, you call [Learned] and [who will not be ſatisfied without ſuch teſtimony from the Ancients, though they be of no conſiderable value in themſelves.] Nor indeed are *thoſe* which *you* produce, of any ſuch moment, as being 1. but words let fall upon the *by*, when they were diſcourſing of *other Arguments*, not *treating purpoſely of this* of Perſeverance. 2. And but ſpoken at moſt of the *actual falling away of ſome men from belief in profeſſion*, not of their falling from *belief in heart*. And 3. But ſpoken of the *poſſible falling away of others* in reſpect of *their own infirmity*, and the *ſtrong temptations of the world* and the *devil*, which *we all* acknowledg; not *denying* (as you pretend) *a ſimple poſſibility of the beſt Saints apoſtaſie*, if they were left in the hand of their *own counſels*; but *affirming they ſhall not be ſo left by the goodneſs of God*. And 4. But ſpoken for the moſt part by the *Fathers*, who *had little or no occaſion to ſift this queſtion*, as being not *then* riſen in the Church, *Pelagius* not having yet diſturbed it.

But however, I will be content to weigh all the Particulars, and firſt what you deliver from *Voſſius*, with whoſe Heifer you ſeem to have ploughed the beſt part o this your Field; and from whom you preſent us, forſooth, the judgment of Anti quity in groſs.

An

And first you tell us, he saith, [*Ex altero hoc Augustiniana sententiæ additamento satis clare liquet, tam Augustinum & Prosperum, quam Pelagium & ejus Reliquias super eo convenisse, quod fides justificans & gratia regenerans amitti possit, & à plerisq; amittatur.*] I grant you that these words fully express *Vossius* his judgment to be, That *Austin* and *Prosper* agreed with *Pelagius* in this, that justifying faith and regenerating grace may be lost, and that they are lost by very many. But how well *Vossius* infers this, remains to be examined.

Well, but [a little after saith *Vossius*, *Neutiquam igitur Antiquitatis mentem assequuntur, qui cum apud Augustinum & alios legunt, Electos Dei vel deficere nunquam, vel ad Deum ante obitum redire, inde colligunt ex eorum sententia, fideles semper in fide perseverare, aut saltem nunquam penitus divina gratia excidere. Quorum argumentum hac nititur Hypothesi, quod fideles & electi ἀντιστρέφωσι, cum juxta Augustinum non reciprocentur electi & fideles, sed fideles perseverantes. Imo omnis disputatio illa, qua Augustino cum Pelagio & Massilienſibus de Perseverantia Sanctorum fuit, Hypothesin plane contrariam habet. Nam nisi concedatur, quosdam fidelium & piorum deficere, nec redire, cadere, nec surgere, cessabit penitus hac quæstio, Cur aliqui eorum perseverant, aliqui non item? de quo inter Augustinum & Adversarios tantopere disceptatum fuit.*]

Here *Vossius* superciliously enough censures those, who conceive *Austin's* judgment to have been, that true believers either always persevere in faith, or at least never fall away utterly from the grace of God. But how justly he doth it, is the question. He pretends, 1. that the ground on which they build their judgment, is a supposition that *Elect* and *True believers* are terms convertible, and that that is false. 2 That *Austins* disputation is built upon another supposition, which he saith is quite contrary to their assertion, *viz.* that true believers do sometimes fall away; for else it were to no purpose to dispute why some persevere, others not. But 1. as to the former, no Divines use to make *elect* and *true believers* convertible: For albeit *many* say, and that truly, that *all true believers* are *elect*, yet *none* say that *all elect* are *true believers*, and so none say that *elect* and *true believers* are *convertible*. Nor is it of any use in this case, to shew that *all elect* are *true believers*; it sufficeth to prove, that *all true believers* are *elect*. For if *all elect persevere*, which *Austin* affirms, *Vossius* confessing it, and *all true believers be elect*, it follows beyond contradiction, that *all true believers persevere*; and so it is rightly concluded, that *Austins* judgment being that *all elect persevere*, his judgment was *that no true believers fall away*. Well, but saith *Vossius*, [according to *Austins* doctrine, not *true believers*, but *true believers persevering* and *elect* are reciprocable.] I answer, 1. that according to *Austin*, *true believers persevering* and *elect* cannot be reciprocable: For *Austin* held many to be *elect*, which were not *true believers*, much less *true believers persevering*; all the elect being *elect*, according to *Austin*, *before the beginning of the world*, and *none* being *persevering* till *they believe*, which *none* do sure *before the beginning of their lives*; nor *till they believe to the last*, which none do till the *end of their lives*. So that *Austin* could not make *true believers persevering* and *elect* to be reciprocable. 2. If *Austin* make *true believers persevering* and *elect* reciprocable, his meaning can be but this, that *all the elect shall be true believers persevering*; and this is as much as we contend for. If he say that all true believers if not persevering are not elect, he saith it of *true believers* in regard of the *matter of their faith*, that is, such as *believe the truth*; but not in regard of the *manner*, such as *truly believe the truth*. And this confirms their *assertion*, who maintain that *Austin* held, that *true believers never fall away*, viz. such as in *truth believe*, albeit such as *believe the truth* may. This distinction of *true believers* clears all: Many who *believe the truth* are not *truly believers*, and *not elect*, and so *may fall away*, without any prejudice to the assertion of *our Divines*, or of *Austin* whom they follow. But *all* who are *truly believers* are *elect*, and so shall *persevere in true believing*, according to *Austins* judgment as well as *ours*.

2. As to the latter, *Austins* disputation is built indeed upon this *supposition*, that *some true believers* in the *first sense*, that is, *believers of the truth* do fall away: but he supposeth not that *true believers* in the *second sense* do fall away; Yea, he determines

againſt it, and ſhews the cauſe of their perſeverance to be in their *election*. Whence I further diſpute thus: If any but the *elect* be *true believers* in this *latter ſenſe*, that is, *truly believers*, then *ſome* who are *not elect* may be *ſaved*: But *none who are not elect may be ſaved*. The *Minor* is beyond all queſtion *Auſtins* poſition: for none but ſuch as *perſevere* may be *ſaved*; but none but ſuch as are *elect perſevere*, according to *Auſtin*, by *Voſſius* his own confeſſion, who ſaith *Auſtin* makes *elect* and *believers perſevering* reciprocable, that is, *all believers perſevering elect*, as well as *all elect believers perſevering*: and as I have ſhewed, *that* is affirmed with much more congruity then *this*. The *Major* I make good thus: All true believers dying ſuch, ſhall ſurely be ſaved; Therefore if any but the elect be true believers, ſome others beſides the elect may be ſaved. I prove the Argument thus: Any true believers may die while ſuch; *Ergo*, if true believers dying ſuch ſhall be ſaved, and ſome who are *not elect* be *true believers*, ſome who are *not elect* may be *ſaved*.

If in the behalf of *Voſſius* it be ſaid, which is the only thing that can be pleaded in bar of my Argument, that thoſe who are *true believers, not being elect*, ſhall not die while *true believers*: I reply, that *Voſſius* who ſaith *that there can be no abſolute certainty that any true believers falling into a horrible ſin ſhall not die before they repent*, cannot gainſay that *there is no abſolute certainty that any true believers ſhall not die, while yet they are not fallen into ſo horrible a ſin as Apoſtaſie*. For 1. ſurely the *one* is no more revealed then the *other*. And 2. it is far more agreeable to the *love of God* to *believers*, to *ſuffer true believers to die before they apoſtatize*, then it is to *ſuffer true believers to die before they repent*. So that this aſſertion of the *abſolute uncertainty that any true believers ſhall not die before they repent*, which *Voſſius* maintains to overthrow our doctrine of Perſeverance of true believers, doth draw a conſequence after it, *that there is the like abſolute uncertainty that any true believers, though not elect* (forſooth) *ſhall not die before they apoſtatize*: which builds up the *poſſibility of the ſalvation of ſome that are not elect*. And how ſuitable this is to the Doctrine of *Auſtin*, I refer to any man that hath any acquaintance at all with it.

If it be replied, that *Voſſius* his *abſolute uncertainty that any true believers ſhall not die before they repent of the horrible ſin* whereinto he ſuppoſeth *them fallen*, be to be underſtood of an *uncertainty* in reſpect of the *ſubject*, or *their own knowledge*, not of an *uncertainty* in reſpect of the *object*, in regard of *Gods determination*:

I anſwer, 1. by *conceſsion*, that it is true; and in that reſpect I ſhall by and by ſhew it to be *impertinently* alleadged by *Voſsius*. 2. By way of *oppoſition*, that he muſt mean it of the *uncertainty* in regard of the *object*, and not only in reſpect of the *perſon*; for that he diſputes againſt the *Doctrine of the certainty of the Perſeverance of the Saints*, in reſpect of the *being of their Perſeverance*, not of their *aſſurance* of their *perſevering*, which is not the queſtion now on foot, but is of a different conſideration. 3. That if *true believers not elect* be as *truly ſuch* as *believers elect*, which if *they be not* there is nothing ſaid to our diſadvantage; then thoſe *true believers not elect* have all as *much intereſt* in *juſtification*, as thoſe *true believers* which are *elect*, and conſequently are *as much* in the *favour of God*, and conſequently have *as much title* to *heaven*; and conſequenntly there is as much *certainty of their ſalvation* in caſe *they die in this eſtate*. And now what ſhould hinder why they ſhould not die in this eſtate? Gods *love* to them, or *hatred* of them, or *careleſneſs* of them? His love to them cannot be pretended; for it would argue more love to them to let them die in this eſtate, wherein they ſhould certainly be ſaved. Nor can it be ſaid that he hates them in this eſtate, wherein they are ſuppoſed as true believers as the elect. Nor may we refer it to his careleſneſs of them; for of the two, there is more reaſon he ſhould have an eſpecial tenderneſs over *them*, who are *as true believers as the elect*, albeit they be *not elect*: For it is to be ſuppoſed, their belief is either *more* from *themſelves* then the elects, or *no more*; if more from themſelves, then ſtill they are more commendable for their belief then the elect, and ſo in reaſon God ſhould have more tender care of them: if no more from themſelves then the elects, then either the elect owe their belief to *themſelves*, which is againſt *Auſtin* as well as the Scriptures, who affirms with them, that *faith is the gift of God*; or the *believers*, who are ſuppoſed ſuch, not being elect,

owe

owe their faith to *God*, and then *God repents of his gift*, if he be not ſo carefull as to *preſerve it till they die*: for either he doth not preſerve it becauſe he *cannot*, or becauſe he *will not*; that he can preſerve it, appears by his preſerving the like gift in his elect; if it be ſaid he will not preſerve it in *theſe* as well as in the elect, then either meerly becauſe *he will not of his own pleaſure*, or becauſe *theſe do not husband it* as well as the elect: If it be ſaid he will not becauſe of his own pleaſure preſerve it in theſe as well as the elect, we make him an accepter of perſons, ſo as to will well to one true believer, and not well to another who is as truly a believer, without any colour for ſuch a conceit in Scripture: if it be ſaid he will not becauſe theſe do not husband it ſo well as the elect, then either the elects *husbanding of their faith* is from *themſelves*, or from *God*; if from themſelves, then they know whom to thank for their perſeverance, without returning the whole praiſe to God; if it be from God, then is God *partial* in giving *true believers who are elect* grace to husband their faith ſo as to perſevere and be ſaved, and in *not giving like grace to thoſe who are as true believers*, and would have continued ſuch as well as any of the elect, had not God left them without thoſe ſupplies which he afforded the elect, who were not more *true believers* then they.

Upon the whole I conclude, That notwithſtanding all *Voſsius* his *ſeverity* in his cenſure, thoſe who conceive *Auſtin's judgment did ſtand for the perſeverance of all true believers, becauſe he affirms the perſeverance of all elect*; do ſhew no leſs skill in *Logick* then *Voſsius* had, albeit he may have had much greater converſe with *Antiquity*. And accordingly he proceeds (and is quoted by you) magiſterially dictating, [*Quid quod antiquitas tota indeficibilitati adverſatur, nec quenquam, quantum meminiſſe valemus, veterum invenire eſt, qui fideles omnes omnimodam de perſeverantia ſua certitudinem habere arbitraretur.*] Very right: But, 1. which of our Divines aſſert an *indefectibility of the Saints*? They all are for a *defectibility* of the Saints as to themſelves; and not only aſſert a *poſsibility* of the Saints *falling*, but an *impoſsibility* of their *ſtanding*, without the eſpecial aſſiſtance of the *Almighty*. This wind hurts no mans corn. 2. What means Mr. *Goodwin* by clapping in [*that* indefectibility *of the Saints which ſome defend?*] This, though it be a *Comment* ſuitable enough to *Voſſius* his *Text*, yet is but a *Comment*; and Mr. *Goodwin* at once wrongs both his *adverſaries*, his *Author*, and his *Reader*, by rendring *Tota antiquitas indeficibilitati adverſatur*, [all Antiquity jointly oppoſeth that indefectibility of the Saints which ſome defend.] Mr. *Goodwins* learned Congregation may be apt to conceive that theſe are *Voſſius* his words *tranſlated*; whereas indeed they are but the *Gloſs* of their Reverend Doctor, who ſets ſuch a mark upon thoſe words [of the Saints which ſome defend] as his Members, who loſt little of their time in Latine, may be apt to apprehend, points them to words of *Voſſius* of *eſpecial emphaſis*, and not of Mr. *Goodwins* own *interpolation*.

But I wis, 1. *Voſſius* doth not put it upon *us*, that *we defend* any *abſolute indefectibility of the Saints*; nor upon the *Antients*, that *they* do *all jointly oppoſe that which we defend*. That he ſaith is but this, *Antiquitas tota indeficibilitati adverſatur*; which is but that all Antiquity is an adverſary to indeficibility; and ſo are all *latter Divines* too, except but ſome new Predicants of the old Order yeleped *Cathari*. Yet 2. *Voſſius* cannot over-confidently affirm that *tota antiquitas adverſatur indeficibilitati*, in our ſenſe; ſeeing he adds, *nec quenquam, quantum meminiſſe valemus, veterum inveniri eſt, qui fideles omnes omnimodam de perſeverantia ſua certitudinem habere arbitraretur*: which implies there may be ſom one or other among the Ancients (albeit *Voſſius* to the beſt of his remembrance knows none ſuch) who may have judged that all the Saints may have *omnimodam certitudinem* of their Perſeverance; and ſure then there muſt be a greater *indeficibilitas* aſſerted by ſuch men, then any of us were ever known to defend. 3. *Voſſius* himſelf doth not handſomly put theſe two togeather, the doctrine of *Perſeverance*, and the doctrine of *Aſſurance*. For 1. albeit we hold the firſt, there is no neceſſity we ſhould hold the latter: We ſay, *all true believers* ſhall *ſurely be ſaved*; we do not ſay that *all ſuch believers are ſure they ſhall be ſaved*. This *certainty* of the *object* may very well conſiſt with an *uncertainty* of the *ſubject*. 2. Nor

do any of our Divines as much as dream that *fideles omnes* have *omnimodam de perſeverantia ſua certitudinem*: For 1. They affirm not that *omnes*, *all* have *any* aſſurance of it; 2. Nor that *any* have *omnimodam certitudinem*, *all aſſurance*; yet may they well enough, that *all true believers* have their perſeverance *ſurely decreed by God*, though that decree be not manifeſted to them *all*, nor made altogether manifeſt to *any* of them.

But 4. Mr. *Goodwin* again wrongs *Voſſius*, his Reader, and Us, by his miſtranſlation; for as before he put in more then *Voſſius* his words would well bear, ſo here he leaves out ſomewhat which ſhould be put in; which *detraction* proves an *addition* to *Voſſius* his words. *Voſſius* his words are,

Nec quenquam, quantum meminiſſe valemus, veterum invenire eſt, qui fideles omnes, omnimodam, de perſeverantia ſua, certitudinem, habere arbitraretur.

Mr. *Goodwin* Engliſheth them, [Nor is there any of the Ancients to be found, who as far as I am able to call to mind, conceiveth that believers have any abſolute certainty of their perſeverance.

He ſhould have ſaid that *all believers have any ſuch certainty*: His leaving out *omnes*, is a clapping in more then too much; as if *Voſſius* had ſaid, *All the Ancients ſay, that no believers have ſuch certainty*; where he ſaith but this, that *All the Ancients ſay all believers have no ſuch certainty*; which certainly is no other then what we all ſay.

I ſee by this, that albeit Mr. *Goodwin* may be not guilty of what ſome have taxed him for, *miſquoting*, yet he is not free from *miſconſtruing* his Authors, which if he do it *unwittingly*, that may be juſtly ſaid of him, which he injuriouſly ſaid of another, that *he halted on his Latine leg*; if *wittingly*, he *walks not with a right foot to the Goſpel*; and his meer Engliſh Readers have little reaſon to aſcribe too much to his Teſtimonies of ſuch as wrote in the *Roman Idiom*.

Nay 5. What if Mr. *Goodwins* Tranſlation of *Certitudinem de perſeverantia* by *certainty of their perſeverance*, be not faithfull enough; theſe words in Engliſh, *certainty of their perſeverance*, are ambiguous, and may as well ſignifie a *certain being of their perſeverance*, which poſſibly ſome of his well-meaning Members may take it for, as a *certain knowledg that they ſhall perſevere*, which is all that the Latine amounts to. It had been fairer to have Engliſhed it by *aſſurance of their perſeverance*. Well let us leave Mr. *Goodwins* Engliſh, and follow *Voſſius* his Latine.

Fatentur quidem animos filiorum Dei, dubitationis anxietate cruciari non debere, cum ſpei fiduciam habeant, qua ſufficienti conſolatione, & lapſuros ſuſtentet, & lapſos levet; at nihilominus negant, poſſe quemvis, exinde quod impræſentiarum fidelium ſe in numero eſſe ſciat, tantum, ſibi de reliquo vitæ tempore, favorem Dei, pro certo polliceri, ut tanquam Divina Revelatione de ſe edoctus, ſpondere auſit, nunquam ſe adulterii, homicidii, idololatriæ reum fore, quanquam David, Solomon, *alii, tantopere à viis Domini declinarant: vel ſi tum illis, in tantum ſcelus prolabatur, tum uti* David, *ita ſibi quoque prorogatum iri vitæ tempus, uſque dum ſeriò pœnitentiam egerit, & reconcilietur Deo.*

They indeed acknowledge that the minds of the children of God ought not to be tortured with any anxiety of doubting, in as much as they have a confidence of hope, which may ſuſtain and keep up with ſufficient comfort, thoſe that may fall, and relieve thoſe that are already fallen &c.]

And do they ſo indeed? then do they acknowledg as much as any of our Divines are wont to contend for; who ſay but this, and no more. But if there be *no certainty of their perſeverance*, in regard of a *Decree of heaven* paſſed in that behalf, then *cannot* the children of God have any *ſuch confidence of hope which may ſuſtain and keep up with ſufficient comfort thoſe that may fall, and relieve thoſe that are already fallen*. For *nothing leſs then ſuch a Decree of heaven*, can avail to *this purpoſe*, conſidering the infirmities and corruptions with which the beſt of the children of God on *earth* are incumbred from within themſelves, and the varieties of *temptations* of all ſorts wherewith they are *encountred* from *without*, both by the *Devil* and the *world*. The conſideration of theſe, muſt needs *cruciate* their hearts with continual perplexities

and

and fears, even while they *ſtand*, that they ſhall *ſuddenly fall*, and that being once *fallen*, they ſhall *never riſe*. Alas, how eaſily is the *beſt* child of God betrayed into the groſſeſt delinquencies? How *difficultly* is he *recovered* out of them? Yea but for the interpoſing of *Gods hand*, how is it *poſſible* he ſhould ſtand upright upon his own feet? It is altogether impoſſible he ſhould ever *ſcrabble up* again, being *once down*. There can be no ground of *confidence* for any man on earth, lower then *heaven* and its *aſſiſtance*; no *confidence* of the aſſiſtance of *heaven*, but what is built on a *Decree* of *heaven*; no *confidence built on any decree* of *heaven*, if that *decree* be built on a mans *own endeavours*. Take away the *freeneſs* of this *decree*, and farewell the *firmneſs* of it. Take away the *firmneſs* of this *decree*, and how *ſorry a foundation* is left for any ſuch *confidence*, as is acknowledged in the *children* of *God*, *which may both ſuſtain and keep up with ſufficient comfort, thoſe that may fall, and relieve thoſe that are already fallen?*

Proceed we to what follows out of *Voſſius* [But *yet they* [the Ancients] *deny that any man, becauſe he certainly knows that he is at preſent in the number of true believers, can therefore promiſe to himſelf upon any certainty, ſuch, or ſo much favour from God for the remaining part of his life, that he may be as bold as if he had it by revelation from God, that he ſhall never incur the guilt of Adultery, Murther, Idolatry, though* David, Solomon, *and others, declined ſo fearfully from the waies of God, as they did.*]

And what I trow do they [the Ancients] *deny* in this, that any of our later Divines do *affirm*? Who among us ever preſumed to ſay that any child of God can upon this ground, that *he certainly knows that he is a true believer at preſent, promiſe himſelf that he ſhall never ſlip into either of theſe horrid ſins; and promiſe himſelf that he ſhall never ſlip into either of theſe horrid ſins, as boldly as if he had it by revelation from God?* and *promiſe himſelf as boldly as if he had it by revelation, that he ſhall never ſlip into either of theſe horrid ſins, though* David, Solomon, *and others declined ſo fearfully from the waies of God as they did?* Yes, *Davids*, *Solomons*, and others declining from the waies of God, ſo fearfully as they did, are irrefragable arguments to convince any child of God, that *though he certainly know himſelf to be at preſent in the number of true believers, yet he may not aſſure himſelf that he ſhall not hereafter be ſuffered to ſlip into the like horrid tranſgreſſions as* David, Solomon, *and other children of God were guilty of.*

None of our Divines uſe to ſay the children of God may preſume to aſſure themſelves of ſo much favour from God, as to keep them from falling into ſuch tranſgreſſions as theſe eminent Saints did.

All they ſay, is but this, *That the children of God may aſſure themſelves from hence, that they are at preſent in the number of true believers, that therefore they ſhall never be in the number of the damned*; that they may aſſure themſelves, *that either God will keep them from committing ſuch abominations, or keep them at leaſt from continuing in them without repentance.* They look on the fals of *David*, *Solomon*, and other Saints, not ſo as to *aſſure themſelves of greater favour from God, to keep them from like fals*; but of *like favour from God to bring them to a like repentance.*

And for this, though they pretend no *particular revelation from God*, yet have they a *revelation in general*, which is *tantamount*, that *whoſoever believes, ſhall not periſh* (as he muſt needs do if he ſhould *be left to lie under the guilt of ſuch ſins without repentance*) *but have life everlaſting*; that of *thoſe which the Father hath given to Chriſt* (as *ſure* he hath all ſuch as truly believe) *Chriſt will loſe none*; but ſure he muſt *loſe all* whom he leaves to *wallow for ever in the guilt of ſuch ſins without repentance*; that *Chriſt hath engaged his Father to keep all his from the evil, though he take them not out of the world, i.e.* to ſecure them from *the aſſaults of Satan, the Prince of the world, and his inſtruments*, ſo as to *keep them down in ſuch ſins*, though not ſo as to *caſt them down*. Now upon theſe grounds it is true that *thoſe who know themſelves to be true believers*, may aſſure themſelves (notwithſtanding all *Voſſius* hath to ſay to the contrary) that *in caſe they ſhall fall into ſuch horrible ſins* with them [the Saints aforeſaid] *they alſo ſhall have the time of their life prolonged, until upon their ſerious repentance, they be reconciled unto God.*

I ſhall now attend, what it pleaſeth *Voſſius* to add,

[*Cujuſmodi enimvero certitudinem, negant expedire in hac vitâ, tot tentationibus obnoxiâ; ubi tanta eſt infirmitas, ut niſi perpetua adſit ſollicitudo, cuſtodiendi gratiam, quam ſemel acceperimus; facillime obrepat carnis ſecuritas; per quam velut bipatentibus portis, undique ſe inſinuent vitiorum caterva.* Hiſtoriâ Pelag. l. 6. Theſi. 12. *Such an abſolute certainty as this they* [the Ancients] *affirm to be inexpedient in this life, being obnoxious to ſo many temptations; and where the weaknes of men is ſuch, that unleſs there be a continual ſollicitouſneſs, and care to keep that grace which we have once received; a carnal ſecurity will moſt eaſily ſteal upon us, through which, as by a broad Gate wide opened, whole Troops of vices are like to convey themſelves into us.*]

But what if ſuch certainty as we contend for, may well ſtand with ſuch a ſollicitouſneſs as *Voſſius* ſaith the Ancients require? Surely the certainty we plead for, is as far from *opening a way to carnal ſecurity*, as a *carnal ſecurity* is ready *to open a Gate to whole Troops of vices.* This *certainty* renders the children of God the more *circumſpect*, and *having theſe promiſes*, they *cleanſe themſelves* ſo much the more induſtriouſly, *from all filthineſs of the fleſh and ſpirit, perfecting holineſs in the fear of God.* 2 Cor. 7. 1.

Every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himſelf, even as God is pure. 1 John. 3. 3.

What is ſo prevalent againſt [the many temptations, whereunto the *preſent life* is obnoxious] as an aſſurance of *eternal life*, which is free from them? 1. What blunts the edge of our fears of miſchiefs on earth, like to this aſſured hope of glory in heaven? He who is ſure of a Crown there, cannot be ſo much affrighted with the croſs here; but *joyfully receive the ſpoyling of his goods, as knowing that he hath in heaven a better and more enduring ſubſtance.* Heb. 10. 34. Stoutly *refuſe deliverance, in hope of a better reſurrection.* Heb. 11. 35. *Account it all joy to fall into divers temptations.* James 1. 2. His *tribulation works patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not aſhamed.* Rom. 5. 3. He rejoyceth to be accounted worthy to ſuffer for the name of Chriſt. *Acts.* 5. This *hope* raiſeth the heart to ſo high a pitch, as that *fear* can hardly reach it. What can *man threaten* that can quell his courage, who is aſſured that he hath ſuch an incomparable intereſt in *God*, that he ſhall *ſhortly* be like the *Angels*, and in the mean time hath the Angels imployed as *Miniſtring ſpirits for his good*, yea who hath his *life hid with Chriſt in God*, who knows that *when God ſhall appear, he ſhall be like him*: As there is no *temptation* ſtronger then that of the *fear of ſuffering*, ſo there is no ſuch ſoveraign *Antidote* againſt *fear* of *ſuffering*, as this *aſſured hope of reigning.* This alone makes; that *in all theſe things we are more then conquerors.*

2. What turns the ſtream of our *hopes* in *this world*, like this *aſſured hope of better things in the next*? He who hath this *hope of eternal glory*, of all others moſt readily overlooks *all temporal preferments*; he who knows himſelf an *heir of heaven*, paſſeth by with an holy ſcorn, all advantages *on earth*; and holds it a ſtouping below himſelf, to liſten to any motions and proffers of theſe inferior *trifles*; *The reproach of Chriſt is a greater treaſure then the Riches of Egipt*; a leſs hope, of courſe, gives way to a greater; ſo that *this hope* fencing a man on both ſides, and arming him both on the *right ſide*, and on the *left*, leaves no place for the [whole troops of temptations to overthrow him] whereas a *ſingle temptation* is too ſufficient to foil *another*; *any ſingle temptation* ſteals into *others*, ſooner then [whole troops of them] can force a way into him who is thus impregnably *fortified.*

That which *Voſſius* ſubjoyneth in the entrance of his Demonſtration of this Theſis,

[*Communem fuiſſe Antiquitatis ſententiam, quam diximus, ſoli hodie negare poſſunt, qui cetera fortaſſe viri ſunt non ineruditi, ſed in Antiquitate tamen plane ſunt hoſpites, vel animum habent unius, & alterius ſententiis, ita mancipatum, ut eorum oculis videre malint, quam ſuis; cumque iis errare præoptent, quam cum aliis bene ſentire,*] doth only ſhew the ſtrength of his own confidence, proves not the weakneſs of others aſſertions. And whereas they affirm that when the Fathers ſay, that grace or faith

may

may be loſt, they ſpeak not of true grace, or true faith, but that which reſembles it only; they will be found to ſpeak upon far better terms of evidence, then *Voſſius* doth in oppoſing them, as wherein he is apparently guilty of ſelf-contradiction.

[*Illud interim maximopere in conſiderationem venit, quod eum Patres fidem poſſe amitti, eoque ex fide haut rectè æternam electionem colligi poſſe contendunt, non omnes de quacunque fidei menſura loquuntur, cum plurimi eorum diſtinguant tres fidei gradus.*

This nevertheleſs is to be taken into ſpecial conſideration, That when the Fathers affirm that faith may be loſt, and therefore that eternal Election cannot rightly be inferred from faith, they do not all ſpeak of any meaſure or degree of faith whatſoever, ſince many of them diſtinguiſh three ſeveral degrees of faith.]

Well, let them not *all* ſpeak of any meaſure or degree of faith whatſoever, and let many of them diſtinguiſh of three degrees; it ſeems then that *ſome* ſpeak of *any meaſure or degree of faith whatſoever*, and *all* do not diſtinguiſh of three degrees, and conſequently *all the Fathers do not agree unanimouſly*, yea that *ſome* of them at leaſt hold that *eternal election* may rightly be inferred from *any degree of faith*: which if ſo, then may ſome of the Saints have that *omnimodam certitudinem*; and I hope this the Fathers *non negant expedire in hac vita*, though it be *tot tentationibus obnoxia*, which doth a little juſtle with what was ſaid in the paſſage quoted *Sect.* 3. But let us hear how they diſtinguiſh three degrees of faith.

[*Quorum primus dat fidei eſſentiam ſecundum quam juſtificat, & dicitur fides viva, atque oppoſitam habet fidem mortuam ac putatitiam, qualis Hypocritarum. Alter gradus addit durationem, qua ratione ſalvificat, ſibique oppoſitam habet fidem, ut vulgò loquimur, quod de hominibus dicit Scriptura fidei eorum per κατάχρησιν tribuentes, ἀφοσιωσιν ſive temporariam, qualis eſt Apoſtatarum. Tertius gradus ſuperaddit ſoliditatem, & dicitur, perfecta, ſolida, radicata; quæ quocunque vitæ tempore certificat, hoc eſt, ut Gregorii Magni verbis utar, ſic confirmat, ut quis ulterius cadere non poſſit, & hoc de ſeſe certiſſimè ſciat: cui gradui opponitur fides debilis, qualis etiam multorum eſt Electorum.*

The firſt of which degrees gives eſſence or truth of being unto faith, in reſpect whereof it juſtifieth, and is called a lively faith: Oppoſite hereunto is a dead and putatitious, or imaginary faith, which is proper to Hypocrites. The next degree adds duration or perſeverance, in reſpect whereof it ſaveth, *i. e.* becomes actually ſaving: Oppoſite to this faith is that which we commonly call Temporary, attributing that improperly to mens faith, which the Scripture attributes unto men themſelves; which is the faith of Apoſtates. The third and laſt degree ſuperaddeth ſolidity; this faith is termed perfect, ſolid, rooted, which at any time of a mans life gives him aſſurance, *i. e.* to uſe the words of *Gregory* the Great, doth ſo confirm and ſtrengthen, that a man cannot fall afterwards, and knows this moſt certainly of himſelf. To this degree of faith a weak faith is oppoſed, which is the faith of many of the Elect.]

In this diſtinction of three ſeveral degrees of faith, there is 1. Somwhat improperly expreſſed as to the *manner*; 2. Somwhat incongruouſly delivered as to the *matter*.

1. It is not proper to ſay, 1. The *firſt degree gives eſſence or truth of being unto faith*; ſurely the *eſſence* is in order of nature before the *degree*, which is but a *modus*. 2. It is not proper to put *ſolidity* after *duration* or perſeverance; for in the order of nature ſolidity muſt needs go before perſeverance; and faith continues becauſe it is ſolid and rooted, it is not made ſolid and rooted by perſeverance.

2. It is incongruous as to the matter, to ſay 1. That *faith juſtifieth, yet doth not ſave*. The Apoſtle hath told us, that *whom God juſtified*, that is, all whom he juſtified, he *alſo glorified*. 2. That *any faith ſaveth*, which *is not ſolid and rooted*. 3. That *any faith is ſo ſolid, as to confirm a man ſo that he cannot fall afterwards*, as long as he is here on earth. For if by falling be meant falling into *ſin*, no faith can ever ſecure a man from ſuch falling as long as he is below heaven: If by falling be meant

falling

falling from the *grace and favour of God*, any faith that perſeveres keeps a man from ſuch falling; and yet *perſevering faith* is ſet by *Voſſius* a pin lower then his *ſolid faith*, which he dignifies with this peculiar priviledge of preſerving a man from falling. 4. It is viſibly incoherent with Mr. *Goodwins* aſſertions, to ſay any faith can confirm a man at ſuch a rate, as to keep him from falling either into ſin, or from the grace and favour of God, here on *earth*: for he is ſcarce certain that the Saints and Angels in *heaven* are ſo confirmed. 5. It is as inconſiſtent with *Voſſius* his Poſition of the danger of that ſame *omnimoda certitudo quæ non expedit in hac vita tot tentationibus obnoxia*, to ſay that *ſolid* faith *ſic confirmat ut quis ulterius cadere non poſſit, & hoc de ſeſe certiſſime ſciat*. Sure *ſolid faith* doth no leſs then *expedire*, and it is that which every man is bound to pray and labour for; but if it be attended with ſo much danger, we had better be without this perillous degree of faith, which diſadvantagiouſly ſuperadds this pernicious ſolidity.

[*Patrum loca* (ſaith *Voſſius*) *quibus dicunt fidem veram quidem amitti poſſe, ſed nunquam non reparari, ſemper loquuntur de ſecundo fidei gradu. At illa quibus aiunt nunquam poſſe amitti omnino, intelligi debent de gradu tertio. Cum quibus minime pugnat quod univerſi alias dicant, multos per defectionem à fide æternum perire. Nam intelligunt fidem primi gradus, hoc eſt formaliter, ſive eſſentialiter veram, ſive quod idem eſt, juſtificam, etſi non ſalvificam; ſed juſtificam κατ' εξιαν per quam quis in præſentia eſt juſtus, non juſtificam κατ' ενεργειαν, quando ſi veritatem finis ſpectemus, vere juſtifica non eſt, quæ aliquando deſinit juſtificare, quia non alia habet promiſſionem vitæ æternæ, quam quæ perſeverat.* Hiſt. Pelag. l. 6. Theſ. 13.

Thoſe paſſages of the Fathers, wherein they ſay that true faith may be loſt, but is always recovered again, always ſpeak of the ſecond degree of faith. But thoſe which ſay that ſuch faith cannot be loſt, muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of the third and higheſt degree of faith. Between which expreſſions, and what they generally teach otherwiſe, *viz.* that many periſh eternally through a falling away from their faith, there is no repugnance: For in ſuch aſſertions as this, they underſtand faith of the firſt degree, *i. e.* ſuch a faith which is formally and eſſentially true, or which is the ſame which is juſtifying, though not actually or in the event ſaving, but juſtifying in the eſſence or ſubſtance of it, in reſpect whereof a man is at preſent juſt, or righteous; not juſtifying in reſpect of continuance, ſince if we conſider the truth of the end, that faith is not truly juſtifying which at any time ceaſeth to juſtifie; becauſe no other faith hath the promiſe of eternal life, but only that which perſevereth.]

So that here *Voſſius* hath ſaid juſt as *we*, that *that faith which is loſt is not truly juſtifying*; and *that faith which is truly juſtifying is not loſt*, which is as much as we contend. And his diſtinction of *juſtifying* κατ' εξιαν, but not κατ' ενεργειαν, is vain: for ſaith he, *that which is not juſtifying* κατ' ενεργειαν, is not juſtifying, and hath not the promiſe of eternal life.

SECT. 5. Whatever it be that hath been hitherto ſaid, Mr. *Goodwin* hath little reaſon to boaſt that [by the expreſs tenor of theſe things it fully appears, that the uniform and conſtant opinion of all Orthodox Antiquity was, That true faith, true grace, true juſtification and forgiveneſs of ſins, may by ſecurity, careleſneſs, ungodlineſs, and profaneneſs of life and converſation, be totally and finally loſt, and the perſons in whom they were ſometimes found, eternally periſh.]

Yea, 1. He ſhould have ſaid but thus, that *Voſſius* ſaith *this was the conſtant opinion of all Orthodox Antiquity*. 2. *Voſſius* ſaith not thus neither; for he confeſſeth, that *that juſtification which is loſt* is *not truly juſtification*. 3. *We* ſay not, but that [by ſecurity, careleſneſs, ungodlineſs, and profaneneſs of life and converſation, they may be loſt:] but we deny that any perſons truly juſtified ſhall be permitted to fall into *ſuch* ſecurity, careleſneſs, ungodlineſs, &c. Did they *fall into them*, we yield juſtification were loſt. 4. *Voſſius* doth contend, that the Fathers held, that *the elect never loſe juſtification ſo as to periſh*; which is the thing that lies on Mr. *Goodwin* to prove againſt us. Whether thoſe who are *not elect* may have *true faith*, is not properly the queſtion; but whether the *Elect have not ſuch faith as cannot be loſt?* And this *faith of the elect Voſsius* hath granted *cannot be loſt in the judgment of Antiquity*; as who hath

hath affirmed, that Antiquity make *elect* and *believers perſevering*, to be *convertible*. Now 6. Whereas Mr. *Goodwin* pretends that [he maintains but this, That a poſſibility of the falling away of true Saints, and true believers, is affirmed by Antiquity.]

1. He indeed affirms that there is a poſſibility of the *falling away of all true Saints, notwithſtanding our Plea of election*, which he profeſſedly diſputes againſt, and which we lay as the *ſoleground* for the *perſeverance of any Saint*.

2. We never deny a *poſſibility of the falling away of the elect*, as to *themſelves*, and are ready to acknowledg an *impoſſibility of their ſtanding*; only we defend this, that *they are preſerved by the power of God, according to his eternal purpoſe of ſaving them*. And thus Mr. *Goodwin* hath hitherto done his own aſſertion little good; and ours as little harm, by all he hath produced out of *Voſſius*.

SECT. 6.

We have no purpoſe to reflect the leaſt diſparagement on the great abilities of *Voſſius*, we cannot do it without drawing contempt on our ſelves; we acknowledg him to have been as great an *Epicure* of Books, as perhaps any this age hath produced, and envie him not. Dr. *Potters* applauſe, that the world knows nothing more learned then this famous man; to whom we are ready to pay all due thanks for his many excellent labours. Yet we know who hath wiſhed that his *ſincerity* had been equal to his *ſufficiency*, and his *integrity* to his *induſtry* in this buſineſs, *Utinam pari fide*, ſaith Dr. *Prideaux*, and Dr. *Twiſſe* in an Anſwer of his, to a conſiderable part of this *Hiſtoria Pelagiana*, though not extant, hath afforded this honourable teſtimony to *Voſſius* his integrity, that he was ſo moderate a man, that he diſcovered a moſt ingenuous correſpondence with the Papiſts, in more particulars then one. *Lubens profiteor me propenſius ferri in amorem hominis, quoties & variam ejus literaturam intuor, & animi candorem, non modo erga fratres, ſed & erga Pontificios, quos pari menſura candoris tractat, atque fratres ſuos, non dicam majori.* Only he doth a little after, *deſiderare Reverentiam verbo Dei debitam*, when *Voſſius* ſaith his brethren defend themſelves in ſome caſes with a piece of the 9 to the Romans, *tanquam objectâ Gorgone*. I have heard Mr. *Goodwin* charged with *diſhoneſtie* (a word which I know not how to *ſpell*) in many of his *quotations* which follow; but I have the charity to conceive he hath not wronged his conſcience in any particular, yea I dare be his compurgator as to that Article. But let us ſee how conſiderably he hath benefited his cauſe by being at the coſt of bringing in ſo many witneſſes to confirm his Aſſertion; yet indeed his quotations of the Ancients, have not ſtood him much, as being all taken from *Voſſius*, who could have furniſhed him with many more in the place.

Moveat cornicula riſum furtivis nudata coloribus.

Only Mr. *Goodwin* hath taught the *Fathers* to ſpeak *Engliſh*, and ſo could his old friend Mr. *Vicars* his Uſher have done, ſooner then teach *children* to ſpeak *Latine* and *Greek*.

Firſt he giveth us [a brief taſte of the ſenſe of ſome of the beſt Authors, who lived and wrote before *Pelagius* was heard of in the world] their Teſtimony is ſo much the leſs to be valued, by his good leave. The truth was never ſo duely ſcanned, never ſo clearly expreſſed, as after *Pelagius* broacht his errors, till then, the Fathers took ſomewhat greater liberty in their Rhetorical expreſſions, as Mr. *Goodwin* worded it in his laſt Paragraph: So that this clauſe [before *Pelagius* was heard of] doth no great good in the place where it ſtands, and only invalidateth the teſtimony of his witneſſes, as who are ſo much the leſs competent evidence, as they had leſs cauſe to be converſant in the matter whereto they are to ſpeak; yet ſhall I not except againſt any of them upon this account.

Firſt then, *vous aves* [*Ireneus*] a good man and true, and [if you enquire after his age, he lived (ſaith Mr. *Goodwin*) about the 172 year after Chriſt] and had he lived about 100 years after *that*, it would have bin all one to the purpoſe, the queſtion being not how near he came to Chriſts *time*, but to Chriſts *Doctrine*, and they who were farther from Chriſts *time* then *Ireneus*, might come nearer to his *truth*, as having grea-

ter opportunities and advantages for the diſcuſſion of it. And ſurely there is ſomewhat in the words of *Irenæus* here produced, which ſhews he had not learned to ſpeak ſo plainly in this obſcure point, but that Mr. *Goodwin* is fain to correct him, while he indoctrinates us, that [by Nature, *Irenæus* (as is eaſily collected from ſome other places in his writings) means, as it is generally, recruited, or relieved, or ſtrengthened by the grace of God in Chriſt] and ſo belike he means the *grace of God in Chriſt doth generally recruit, relieve, or ſtrengthen Nature.* I would we might learn from either *Irenæus* or Mr. *Goodwin*, *wherein*: This is not diſcernable ſure in the *greater part of the world*, that *nature* hath received ſuch a *recruit*: It ſeems *Irenæus* had not overmuch ſtudied the point, whereto he is now called, good man, out of his grave, to ſpeak as the fore-man of Mr. *Goodwins* Evidence. And beſides his uſing *nature* for *grace*, and his being [relieved in this expreſſion] by Mr. *Goodwin*, ſhews there is ſuch a correſpondency between *Irenæus* and Mr. *Goodwin*, that we have ſomewhat to plead againſt him; yet let him ſpeak as much as Mr. *Goodwin* deſires he ſhould. Silence then, What ſaith *Irenæus* to the point in hand, *Whether the Elect may fall away, yea or any true believers, all whom* we acknowledg *Elect*, though Mr *Goodwin* deny *any elected particularly?*

Why [*Sed quoniam omnes ejuſdem ſunt naturæ, & potentes retinere, & operari bonum, & potentes rurſum amittere id, & non facere juſte, apud homines ſenſatos, quanto magis apud Deum, alii quidem laudantur, & dignum percipiunt teſtimonium electionis bonæ, & perſeverantiæ; alii vero accuſantur, & dignum percipiunt damnum, eo quod juſtum, & bonum Reprobaverunt.*] Iren. adverſus Hæreſ. Lib. 4. cap. 74. circa initium.

But becauſe all men are of the ſame nature, having power as well to hold as to work that which is good; and power again to loſe it, and not to do it; ſome are juſtly even with underſtanding men (how much more with God?) commended, and receive a worthy teſtimony of a good election, and of a continuance therein; others again are accuſed, and receive a juſt dammage becauſe they rejected that which is juſt and good.]

Here I obſerve, 1. That *Irenæus* ſpeaks not of *nature* as *recruited*, *relieved*, and *ſtrengthned* by *grace*, as much as Mr. *Goodwin* pretends he doth, while he teſtaies to ſave his witneſſes credit, as to the *firſt part* of *power to do good*, he betraies *his own*, as to the *ſecond power to loſe it*, and *not to do it*; for as it is incongruous to ſay that *nature, unleſs relieved by grace, hath power to do good*: ſo is it to ſay, *that as recruited, relieved, and ſtrengthned by grace, it hath power to loſe it, and not to do juſtly*, taking the *quatenus reduplicative.*

2. That the good which *Irenæus* ſpeaks of, is ſuch, as that the *retinere* is before the *operari*, and the *amittere* before the *non facere juſte*, ſo that he ſpeaks of *habits* of *good*, as *vertues*, or the like, in the *retinere*, and *amittere*, and of *acts* in the *other parts.*

3. That the *election* which *Irenæus* ſpeaks of, is not *Gods election of men*, but *mens election of good*, oppoſed to that act of *reprobation*, which is *mens*, not *Gods Reprobaverunt.* And ſo in this there is nothing pertinent to our buſineſs, which is concerning *mens perſeverance*, by vertue of *Gods electing them to grace, as a means to glory*, not of *their perſeverance in vertue, which is of their own election*, and which many, even by the help of nature, whereof *all men are partakers*, may make, and yet not belong to the bleſſed number of the *elect of God.*

4. It is clear, that *Irenæus* ſpeaks of *men electing*, and *reprobating*, either ſo as *refuſing good* at *firſt*, or at leaſt *not perſevering* in it, but rejecting it at *laſt*; and to this they are enabled by their *common nature*, and ſo are capable of praiſe or diſpraiſe from *men*, and reward or puniſhment from *God*, which creatures that have not this nature, ſuch as are all *bruits* and *inferior creatures*, are not capable of. So that here is nothing ſaid againſt what we affirm, the impoſſibility of the Saints falling by reaſon of their Intereſt in the eternal election of God. *Irenæus* ſhews men being by nature ſo framed, as to be able to *doe*, or *not do* what ſhall ſeem *good* to them, are capable of being *rewarded by God* for their *elections* and *perſeverance* in *them*, and *puniſhed* for their *refuſing good*, which they ſhould *chuſe*, or *reprobating* that which they *had choſen*: *We* ſay the ſame,

ſame, and add, it hath not the leaſt ſhadow of contradiction to our Aſſertion, that albeit *all men* be by *nature* in a capacity of electing and reprobating *moral good*, and being accordingly rewarded or puniſhed, which no beaſts are, yet God hath decreed to give ſome *ſpiritual graces*, and ſo to preſerve them by thoſe *graces*, that they ſhall acknowledg his *goodneſs in electing them to his grace from eternity*, and *preſerving them in it*, which is a mercy that he hath not vouchſafed to the *greater part* of mankind.

Thus this exanimate *Irenæus* confeſſeth himſelf a meer ſtranger, and utterly unacquainted with the matter in the Article, to which he is called to ſpeak; and ſo may be diſmiſſed from farther attendance; Farewell St. *Irenæus*; and make room for [*Tertullian*] whom we will not choak with an objection of *Montaniſm*, conſidering the good man was drawn in meerly by his ſtrictneſs, *Et quia maluit ſæpius jejunare, quam nubere*, let him ſpeak as he thinks Good in the Caſe depending between us.

[Whatever it be (ſaith he) that my meanabilities have attempted, in reference to an entring upon, and holding out in a courſe of repentance, doth indeed concern all thoſe that have addicted themſelves unto the Lord, as perſons who all ſeek after ſafety or ſalvation by pleaſing God; but it concerns thoſe more nearly, who are yet Novices, and beginning very diligently to water their ears with the Words of God, like young Whelps, whoſe ſight is not yet perfectly come to them, move up and down at uncertainty, *& dicunt* [*diſcunt*] *priſtinis* quidem *renunciare, & pœnitentiam aſſumunt, ſed includere eam negligunt*. Tertul de pœnit. c. 6.]

And what is this to prove *true believers fall away?* As for theſe [your Whelps] they are but 1. Such as either [*dicunt priſtinis renuntiare*] many ſay more then they doe; or [*diſcunt*] at moſt, many *learn*, that never *come to the knowledg of the truth*; and many *come to the knowledg*, that never come to the *practice of it*; or 2. Such as [*pœnitentiam aſſumunt*] this word [*aſſumunt*] ſhews they rather put on the *face*, then have the *hearts* of *penitents*; and that [*includere eam negligunt*] confirms it. Now do our Divines uſe to deny but that *many ſuch fall away?* Or can you prove that ſuch are *true believers?* Nay *Tertullian* ſaith expreſly, *Sed iſta ingenia de ſemine Hypocriturum pullulare conſueverunt, quorum individua cum Diabolo amicitia eſt, quorum pœnitentia nunquam fidelis.* And onwards ſaith *Tertullian*, *Quidam autem ſic opinantur, quaſi Deus neceſſe habeat, præſtare etiam indignis quod ſpoſpondet & liberalitatem ejus faciunt ſervitutem. Quod ſi neceſſitate vobis ſymbolum mortis indulget, ergo invitus facit, quis enim permittet permanſurum id, quod tribuerit invitus? non enim multi poſtea excidunt? ? nonne à multis donum illud auferetur?*

Well, who are thoſe that think ſo? Why ſuch as conceived they might allow themſelves what liberty to ſin they liſted between their entrance by the Order of *Catechumeni*, and their Baptiſm, and that Baptiſm would take off all their ſins. Againſt theſe ſpeaks *Tertullian*, not of any true and cordial believers. *Hi ſunt ſcilicet qui obrepunt, qui pœnitentiæ fidem aggreſſi, ſuper arenas domum ruiturum collocant, nemo ergo ſibi aduletur quia inter Auditorum Tyrocinia deputatur, quaſi eo etiam nunc ſibi delinquere liceret. Dominum ſimul cognoveris, timeas; ſimul inſpexeris reverearis; cæterum quid te cognoviſſe intereſt, cum iiſdem incubas, quibus retro ignarus? Quid autem te à perfecto ſervo Dei ſeparat? An alius eſt intractis Chriſtus alius Audientibus? vide ſequeniar.* In which he clearly diſcovers the hypocriſie of ſuch wretches, ſo far was he from looking upon them as true believers, and conſequently from ſaying ought againſt our aſſertion. [He ſpeaks (ſaith Mr. *Goodwin*) of the gift of juſtification, or remiſſion of ſins, which the Ancient Fathers more generally held, was conferred in baptiſm, at leaſt where there was any meetneſs in the perſon baptized.] Be it ſo; What [meetneſs] was here I pray in theſe whom he calls *præſumptores* in the words a little after. And ſo adiew *Tertullian*.

Appear next *Gregory Nazianzen*; What ſaith this Examinate? [Take heed thou keepeſt thy cleanneſs, leſt otherwiſe thou be ſick again of thy Flux of blood, and ſhalt not be able to take hold of Chriſt, ſo as to ſteal a cure from him.] *Orat.* 40. Good counſel, and no other then ſuch as *we* are *all* ready to give, who yet deny that any *throughly cured* ſhall ever relapſe ſo as to die. SECT. 7.

Such counſels indeed intimate a *poſſibility of relapſing* ſo, nor doe we deny it in reſpect of the *corruption* remaining in every Saint; they intimate nothing againſt Gods eternal *purpoſe* of *preſerving them from relapſing* by his *overruling grace*. Yea, he uſeth ſuch *counſels* in the *mouths* of his Miniſters, as means whereby to repreſs theſe *corruptions* in the *hearts* of his Saints. The caution which he ſubjoins a little after, goes not a foot before it in proving what yon contend for. [Take heed leſt by committing ſin, thou lieſt again in thy bed, &c. Remember this ſaying, *Behold thou art made whole, ſin no more leſt a worſe thing come unto thee.*] Such counſels of the Miniſters no way prove, that *God* in his eternal counſel decreed not the preſerving of theſe holy, yet but imperfectly holy ſouls, from relapſing to deſtruction. The *poſſibility* both of a total and final declining in the Saints as to themſelves, is readily granted. We affirm though an *impoſsibility* of it in reſpect of Gods gracious ſupporting them; nor doth any thing in theſe paſſages look as if it had any mind to gainſay it. If this be all *Gregory Nazianzen* hath to ſay in the *point*, it is not worth a *pin*. *Exit Nazianzen.*

SECT. 8. *Chryſoſtome* may [ſpeak as plainly, and without parable, the ſame things with the former, and that frequently.] He doth advantage you juſt no more then *Nazianzen*. We have had the words you quote from him once before, *Chap.* 8. *Sect.* 59. but this [Engliſh ſound] which you ſay they make, is to me like Heathen Greek. [Although the graces and gifts of God are without repentance, yet malice prevailed ſo far, as to diſſolve this law. What then is there of more grievous conſequence then to remember injuries, which appears to be a ſubverter of ſo great a gift of God? meaning *juſtification*, or *remiſsion of ſins*.] This proves not that any juſtified perſon ſhall fall into this ſin, ſo as to continue in it to the end; only that if he ſhould, he ſhould loſe his juſtification, which we are ready to yield; and further add, that as long as he continues in it, he loſeth the comfort of his juſtification.

That which [this Father further ſaith in his 7. and 8. Sermons inſcribed unto *Theodorus, fallen from a vertuous life*] proves not that he fell finally or totally from *grace*. Poſſibly the *Fathers Sermons* might be a means to *recover him*: but however, if he were not recovered, his *life* before might be *vertuous*, his *ſoul* was not *gracious*. What *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaks of him in his Rhetorical expreſſions, is no Logical demonſtration of *true grace* in him.

SECT. 9. Nor doth [the paſſage of the ſame Father upon *John* 1. 12.] better prove any ſuch final or total Apoſtaſie of the Saints as you contend for. What if [none ſhall be able to deprive us of the power to be made the ſons of God, unleſs we our ſelves firſt ſhall deprive our ſelves of it; and we have (as you infer) a power to deprive our ſelves of that power?] We grant it; but affirm that *God* hath engaged *himſelf* to overrule that unhappy power of ours by his own bleſſed power. Now [*our power to deprive our ſelves of it*] is no match for *Gods power*, which he hath promiſed to imploy for *preſerving* us in this happy eſtate. That *Judas* was ever a child of grace, is more then the Scripture ever affirmed, whatever *Chryſoſtome* did: Chriſt ſaith expreſsly of him, that he was a Devil, before his treaſon; and let him be, as *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, [once a child of the Kingdom] viz. *viſible*, it follows not he was of the *inviſible*. He was an *outward member* of the Church, that was all; juſt as were *all thoſe* [who having aſcended the top of heaven] in outward profeſſion, [came afterward to the gulf of all wickedneſs.] Their actions when they were moſt *ſpecious*, were not *ſpiritual*. What think you of [their chuſing wilderneſſes to live in?] did that argue them more *holy* then if they had lived in the *City of London?* May not ſome, yea many of your Congregation at *Colemanſtreet* be more holy then thoſe old *Separatiſts* in the Deſart? What think you of [their ſhewing all manner of abſtinence?] were they ever the *holier*, then if they had allowed themſelves a *moderate uſe of the creatures, which God made to be received with thanksgiving?* May not there be as good Saints at a *Love-feaſt*, as any of theſe *ſullen Faſters?* And how appears it [they never dreamed of a woman?] when their *bodies* were in their *caves*, their *fancies* might walk abroad among their *Ldies?* Or ſay they did not, had they been ever the *leſs holy*,

holy, if they had *ſlept* by their *wives* ſides? I dare be ſworn for you at any time, you are not of *Syricius* his mind, nor would allow his conſtruction of *Qui ſunt in carne, Deo placere non poſſunt.* By this reckoning, the Monks in their Cloiſters ſhould be many of them better Saints then moſt of the Members of your Church; which far be it from me to dream. Only I ſet down this, to ſhew the *hollowneſs* of that *holineſs*, [from which theſe men fell into the gulf of wickedneſs:] Their *fall* from *ſuch holineſs*, proves not the *apoſtaſie* of *true Saints* from *real grace.*

Origen ſaith leſs to prove it, or rather ſomwhat to diſprove it. [But if a ſatiety overtaketh any of thoſe, who have ſtood in an eminent or perfect degree of Chriſtianity, I do not conceive that ſuch a one becomes a bankrupt in grace, or falls to nothing on the ſudden, but that he muſt needs waſte by little and little, and by ſteps and degrees: So that it may ſometimes come to paſs, that if ſome ſhort relapſe happeneth, and he ſpeedily repenteth, and cometh again to himſelf, that he doth not utterly ruine himſelf, but recovereth his foot, and returneth to his former ſtate, and may repair that which through negligence is fallen down.]

Theſe words ſeem to me to make more for the *returning* of the Saints, then for their *final* or *total falling from grace.* How *recovering foot* ſhould prove a *total falling*; how *returning*, a *final departing*; how *repairing*, a *full decay*, I ſhall wait Mr. *Goodwin's* leiſure to indoctrinate me; I confeſs it exceeds my poor apprehenſion. Nor do I well underſtand how thoſe words [He muſt needs waſte by little and little] prove a *waſting* or *conſuming*, ſo much as *deny* a waſting or conſuming of a ſtock of grace *all at once.* Which will help to ſave the credit of *ſome Saints*, that though they ſeemed to be at a *loſs*, they were not *bankrupt*, and ſo not *totally* fallen by their groſs ſins, and much leſs *finally.* But next, how any ever fell from that ſame [*ſummo perfectoque gradu*] is more then I can reach, as who cannot yield that ever *any attained to it*; and if ſo, *none* were in danger of *falling from it.*

Laſtly, bear theſe words what they will, I know not why we ſhould be born down with any words of *Origen*, who was held none of the moſt Orthodox men in more points then one; and if I ſhould urge his authority to prove that *all ſouls fell before they were united to their bodies*, when alone they ſtood in that [*ſummo perfectoque gradu*] you would think I might have ſaved my labour, and that more words then theſe would have been all but *wind.* Theſe make as much *noiſe*, to no more *purpoſe.*

But [*Ambroſe* is of *Origens* and your judgment; and he is, I confeſs, of more authority, as who durſt tell his mind to his Prince to his *face*, which is ſomwhat more then writing a whole book againſt him behind his *back:* To touch the *beard* of a *living* and lively *Lyon*, is more then to ſtrike out the *teeth* of a *dead* one. Well, [his judgment is ſo clear, that you leave the Reader to ſatisfie himſelf in it, only by looking back to *Chap.* 13. *Sect.* 28. of this preſent diſcourſe.] It ſufficeth me to deſire him to pleaſe to compare my Anſwer with what you have ſaid upon the place, where I have ſhewed *Ambroſe's* words to be but as *Calvin's*, and ſo neither of them are of any prejudice to our thoughts in this point.

Now to what [*Ambroſe* ſaith in his Comment on the 9. to the *Rom.* v. 13. *Præſciens itaque Deus mala illos voluntatis futuros, non illos habuit in numero bonorum.* God therefore foreknowing that they would be perſons evilly diſpoſed, did not account them in the number of good men: *Ergo*, thoſe whom God [accounts in the number of good men] will never be perſons evilly diſpoſed; which is as much as to ſay, will never *fall away.* This teſtimony hitherto weighs little. Well, but [he further proceeds; *Quamvis dicat Salvator illis ſeptuagiata duobus diſcipulis quos elegerat ſecunda claſſe, qui ab illo poſtea receſſerunt, Nomina veſtra ſcripta ſunt in cœlo.* Although our Saviour ſaith to thoſe Seventy two Diſciples whom he choſe in the ſecond rank, who afterwards went back from him, *Your names are written in heaven.*]

1. Then this [*Although*] belike ſhews that their *names were written in heaven* who were never [*good men in Gods account.*] 2. That [ſuch whoſe *names were written in heaven*, have notwithſtanding fallen and miſcarried.] If the firſt be true, the latter need not ſeem ſtrange: but it were ſtrange the firſt ſhould be true in any other ſenſe then this, That ſome men whoſe names are written in heaven in reſpect of *ſome priviledges*, were *never good*; not that theſe mens names are written in heaven *to all intents and purpoſes of ſalvation.* For the underſtanding of this, we are to conſider, that the *writing of names in heaven* ſignifies as much as *enjoying an intereſt in the kingdom of heaven.* Now the Kingdom of heaven is either *lower*, or *higher*: Many who were never *good*, have their names written in the Kingdom of heaven, *viz.* in the *lower*, *i.e.* they are members of the *viſible Church*; who have not their names written in heaven, *viz.* the *higher*, are never like to receive any *benefit* there.

Yet, 1. to have our names written in heaven in the very firſt ſenſe, is indeed a *priviledge* beyond *having the Devils ſubject unto us*, and ſuch as we have far more cauſe to rejoice in. The Devils have been ſometimes ſubject to thoſe who have not attained ſo far as *this writing of their names in heaven*; *viz.* to the ſons of *Sceva* and ſome others, who *caſt out Devils by the Devils own conſent.* Therefore even *this* was enough for our Saviour to bid them rejoyce in, more then in having the Devils ſubject unto them. 2. Theſe to whom Chriſt ſpake, had *ſome*, yea moſt of them doubtleſs their names written in heaven, in the *latter* ſenſe; and albeit *ſome* did depart from him, *all* did not: He addreſſed his ſpeech, we will grant, to *all*; yet intended it chiefly, or rather only to *theſe*. As when we ſay to a company of Scholars, *Rejoyce in this*; not that you have ſuch and ſuch *prerogatives* above vulgar men, but that you have the happineſs to ſpend your time in *contemplation*: This of *ſpending time in contemplation* is peculiar but to *ſome few* of them, albeit the *Priviledges of Scholars* extend to *all*. As many of thoſe whoſe *names were written in heaven*, had cauſe to rejoyce in it, more then in *having the Divels ſubject unto them*; but *all* who had the Devils ſubject unto them, had not their names written in heaven. 3. Chriſt ſhews the *writing of mens names in heaven* to be a greater cauſe of rejoicing then the *having the Devils ſubject unto them*; he ſaith not, that all theſe had their names thus written in heaven. As when I ſay to men, *Rejoyce in this becauſe you are good, not in this that you are great*; my meaning is not to affirm that they *are good*, but that *being good* is a greater cauſe of *rejoycing* then being *great*: I only aſſert *goodneſs* to be *matter* of *rejoycing*; not the *men* to be *ſubjects* of *goodneſs*.

But what is this which follows out of *Ambroſe*? [*Sed hoc propter juſtitiam, quia hoc eſt juſtum, ut unicuique pro merito reſpondeatur.* But this was for their righteouſneſs ſake, for it is meet that every man ſhould have as he deſerveth.] *Chaw* upon this bit as much as you will, you will hardly *ſwallow* it. Who, I pray, [*deſerveth*] that his name ſhould be written in heaven? Well, but [*Quia boni erant, electi erant ad miniſterium, & erant ſcripta nomina illorum in cœlo, propter juſtitiam, ſicut dixi.* Becauſe they were good, they were choſen to the Miniſtery, and their names were written in heaven, for their righteouſneſs ſake as I ſaid.]

1. This ſhews what is meant by their *names being written in heaven*, viz. their obtaining a place in the *Church* here *below*, and that as *Miniſters*; not their intereſt in *the Church which is above.* 2. That which follows immediately, that [according to the preſcience of God they were in the number of evil men, *ſecundum præſcientiam Dei erant in numero malorum*] ſhews that this is not to be underſtood of any intereſt theſe men had in the *Kingdom of heaven above*, as being ſtill reckoned by God among thoſe evil men who ſhall never come *thither*. And the words which follow a little after in the Author, though you in your wiſdom think good to omit them, make it clear. *Unde & Moyſi dixit, ſi quis peccaverit ante me, delebo eum de libro meo, ut ſecundum juſtitiam Judicis tunc videatur deleri cum peccat, juxta præſcientiam vero nunquam in libro vitæ fuiſſe. Hinc & Apoſtolus Johannes de hujuſmodi ait, ex nobis exierunt, ſed non fuerunt de nobis.* What think you of theſe mens intereſt in heaven, who indeed were never in the book of life?

Yea, but they were *good men* tho, ſuch I wis as [*Saul* and *Judas*] as it follows in your

your quotation out of *Ambroſe*? And was that goodneſs worth mentioning? *Good* they were in the eyes of *men*, but *bad* enough at their beſt in the eyes of *God*, who knew them to be *evil*, when they ſeemed moſt *good*.

And yet ſtill there is another clauſe very conſiderable, that *Saul and Judas were ſo good, that their goodneſs was not altogether loſt when they were at the worſt.* [*Hinc eſt unde Iudas, poſt mali totius admiſſi ſcelus, pœnitentia motus laqueo vitam finivit, non poteſt enim in aliquo omne bonum penitus obliterari.*] *Ambroſe* makes *Judas* his goodneſs, as little as it was, to have been ſo *great*, that (ſaith he) it was not utterly loſt, becauſe forſooth he repented ſo as to hang himſelf. This paſſage then rather makes for an odd kind of *Perſeverance* of ſuch Saints as *Judas*, rather then for a *total* and *final Apoſtaſie* of *true Saints*. And this is the laſt reſult of this his worthy teſtimony in your behalf.

The other ſnap which you quote out of this Father, I have not had the luck to find, albeit I have loſt ſome time in ſeeking of it; but however I will take it up upon your credit. [*Aliquoties primi ſunt boni, qui futuri ſunt & permanſuri mali, propter quod etiam dicuntur ſcribi in libro vitæ, & deleri.*] But what is this *bonitas* for which they are ſaid to be *written in the book of life*? A *goodneſs* in *our eyes*, for which our charity looks upon them as written in the book of life: But this goodneſs, as great as it may ſeem in our eyes, is ſo little in God's, that as we heard before from *Ambroſe*, *Nunquam in libro vitæ ſcriptus fuiſſe.* Much *good* now may this Teſtimony do you; we are never like to be the *worſe* for it.

Your next man is *Cyprian de Orat. Dom. cap.* 17. [*Et qui* [*ſervus*] *poſt dimiſſum* SECT. II.
ſibi a Domino debitum, conſervo ſuo noluit ipſe dimittere, in carcerem relegatur: quia indulgere conſervo ſuo noluit, quod ſibi a Domino indultum fuit amiſit. By the favour (ſay you) which this ſervant loſt after it had been vouchſafed unto him by his Lord, he clearly means the pardon of his ſins. Therefore juſtification or pardon of ſin may according to the Doctrine of this Father be loſt, yea ſo loſt, as never to be found again.] Yes, but this *Pardon* was but a *Reprieve*, as I have ſhewed heretofore; a *forbearance* only, not a *diſcharge* of the debt. Elſe, where God gives a *true pardon*, that *pardon* produceth ſuch a *love to God* and *his ſervants*, as prevents the *offence* into which this ſervant fell, and the *miſchief* which fell upon this ſervant. Where many ſins are forgiven, there is much of love; the ſenſe of Gods mercy to his ſervants, makes his ſervants the more compaſſionate to their *fellows*, the more obſervant of their *Lord*.

But the [ſame Father ſaith further, that *Solomon*, *Saul*, and many others were able to retain the grace that had been given them, whiles they walked in the wayes of the Lord; but *recedente ab ipſis diſciplina divina, receſſit & gratia.*] Well, what was this *grace*? To find out that, let us conſider what was this *diſcipline*. Shall we take it *actively*, or *paſſively*? If actively, for *Gods teaching them*, then I hope it was *grace*, and preceded their *walking in the wayes of the Lord*: If paſſively, for their *ſubmiſſion to Gods teaching*, and ſo *walking in the wayes of the Lord*, then it was *after grace* ſtill; and *grace continuing* would have *continued their walking in the wayes of the Lord*. But this *grace* now, by your good leave, ſignifies not the *aid of the Spirit* ſo much as the *bleſſings* received by way of *reward* for ſervices done by the aid of the Spirit. Now theſe are either *common*, or *peculiar* to the *Elect*, as are the *aids* of the *Spirit*; and upon the loſs of *diſciplina divina, recedit & gratia*: but there is no ſuch departure of *diſciplina* or *gratia* peculiar to the Elect, but only of that *common diſciplina & gratia*, of both which *Saul* had as much not only as *Solomon*, but as *David* himſelf.

But yet [again the ſame Author ſaith further, *Plane eadem gratia ſpiritualis, quæ æqualiter à credentibus in Baptiſmo ſumitur, in converſatione atque actu noſtro poſtmodum vel minuitur, vel augetur; ut in evangelio Dominicum ſemen æqualiter ſeminatur, ſed pro varietate terræ aliud aſſumitur, aliud in multiformem copiam, vel tricteſimi, vel ſexageſimi, vel centeſimi numeri fructu exuberante cumulatur.*] And what of this? 1. What is this *gratia ſpiritualis*, which is equally received of all that believe

in

in Baptiſm? Be it *juſtification, adoption,* you will not I hope have it to be *ſanctification*; that though it be *æque*, yet is not *æqualiter* received of all *that believe* in Baptiſm. Yet let that paſs. 2. What if [this grace equally received of all that believe in Baptiſm, *minuitur vel augetur* in our converſation and acting?] This [*minuitur*] will never be ſo *enlarged*, as to ſignifie a *total loſs*. *Minuitur*, I take it, is different from *abſumitur*; and then let there be never ſo much *decay* acknowledged, there will hence be inferred no *deſtruction* of grace, no *total* or *final apoſtaſie*. Yea, and 3. what if *aliud abſumitur?* That *abſumitur* is more then *minuitur*, I grant; but *aliud abſumitur* weighs not a jot more. And 4. what if *pars Dominici ſeminis abſumitur*, in the Parable? that proves not that any part of true grace is *loſt*; for that *pars Dominici ſeminis* repreſents only the *outward means*, or *common grace* at moſt, not that which is *truly ſanctifying*.

But laſtly, if *Cyprian's* own words will not make for your advantage, you have yet put ſome into his mouth that ſhall. [A little after (you ſay) he tells us; *Et contra, ſæpe nonnulli de illis qui ſani baptizantur, ſi poſtmodum peccare cæperunt, ſpiritu immundo redeunte quatiantur; ut manifeſtum ſit Diabolum in baptiſmo, fide credentis excludi, ſi fides poſtmodum defecerit, regredi.*] 1. The Latine I acknowledge to be *Cyprian's*; but you have Engliſhed *ſani* by [ſpiritually ſound] whereas *Cyprian* means no more then bodily ſound, oppoſing theſe his *ſani* to ſuch as were baptized in their beds, and thence called *Clinici*. 2. Make the moſt of [*Si fides poſtmodum defecerit, & Diabolum regredi*] The *firſt* will amount to no more then this, that their faith may have *declined*, not that it was *deſtroyed*; and the *latter* proves but a return of the Devil to *vex* them as formerly, not to *devour* them. So then *Cyprian* in all theſe four paſſages hath not one word to your purpoſe.

SECT. 12. *Chromatius* his words are but to the ſame purpoſe with the firſt of *Cyprian's*; nor will I trouble the Reader with another anſwer.

Macarius doubtleſs will bleſs us with ſome extraordinary notion. The firſt part of the paſſages you quote out of him, is Doctrine; the ſecond, an Uſe for the Doctrine.

The Doctrine is but a Repetition of that paſſage of *Paul*, *Heb.6.* and ſo need not put us to the charge of any other anſwer then what was given to that Text more then once before. It ſpeaks of *common*, not *ſaving graces*; and ſuch are all thoſe *gifts* and *ornaments Macarius* mentioneth.

2. The Uſe, [*Quapropter certandum eſt, & ſumma prudentia nobis cavendum, ut cum timore ſalutem noſtram operemur, ſicut ſcriptum eſt; Quicunque ergo participes facti eſtis ſpiritus Chriſti, in nullo puſillo vel magno contemptum vos geratis, neque gratiam ſpiritus contumelia afficiatis, ne exuletis a vita quam jam adepti eſtis.*] It is juſt ſuch a Uſe as Mr. *Perkins*, and the other aſſertors of Perſeverance, were wont to make every time they fell upon this point. Did any one hear us ever gather a contrary Corollary from our Doctrine; or are we wont to preach our Doctrine without adding this? Why, but [*ne exuletis a vita quam adepti eſtis*] carries it clear that this Fathers judgment is againſt us for a total and final falling of the Saints. But 1. *ne exuletis* ſhews but a *poſſibility* of it, which we have all along owned, and granted that which is more, an *impoſſibility of the Saints ſtanding*, as of *themſelves*. 2. *Exuletis* ſignifies not as much as *deſtruction of faith*: Many a *baniſhed* man hath *returned*; and we have known ſome who returned with more glory, then they were baniſhed with diſgrace. What think you of three Men, that I need not name? 3. *Exuletis* ſignifies not as much as a *baniſhment ſo far off*, as that the *baniſhed* ſhould not *hear from his country*, and receive continual *ſupplies* from it. 4. *Exulare a vita*, is a *ſtrong line*, and ſo yields but a *weak argument*: The Rhetorick of it, which was chiefly intended, is ſoon deflowred, if it be too hard wringed with that ſame *club-fiſt* of Logick. I care not to ſay more to this paſſage; though poſſibly Squire *Lilburns* Jury have much more to add concerning this ſame [*ne exuletis a vita.*]

Well, but attend we *Macarius*, who here makes an Oration longer then a new Juſtices Charge. [*Cæterum ubi anima gratiam eſt adepta, tum intellectu multo atque per-*

perſpicacia opus eſt, quæ etiam ipſa largitur Deus animæ, ab eo poſtulanti, ut gratiſſime in eo poſſit inſervire, in eo ſpiritu quem accepit, & in nullo vincatur à malitia, aut fallatur per ignorantiam, temeritatem, ac ignaviam, averſa peragens omnia, præter decorum divinæ voluntatis.]

Now good Sir, do not we all ſay that [there is need of much underſtanding and perſpicacity after grace received?] Do *you* ſay that this [underſtanding and perſpicacity] are the gifts of God, as plainly as *we*? Do not *we* ſay more clearly then *Macarius* himſelf, that [it concerns a gracious ſoul to take heed, and to pray daily, that ſhe may be preſerved from doing all things beſides the comely Order preſcribed by the Divine Will?] *We* ſay without Parable, that there is nothing ſo contrary to the Divine will, but that the moſt gracious ſoul would fall into it, if left to *it ſelf*. *Macarius* and we agree, whatever he and you do. Well but what follows? [*Talem enim animam manet ſupplicium, mors, & luctus,*] 1. We ſay ſo too, of any ſoul that being left deſtitute of the divine grace, *peragit omnia præter decorum divinæ voluntatis.* 2. Nay more, we ſay the ſame of any ſoul that being left deſtitute of the divine grace *peragit aliqua*, whatever they be, *præter decorum divinæ voluntatis.* Be it true [*talem animam manet ſupplicium.*] Is there none trow you but *eternal*? we had thought that there had bin *temporal* ſcourges laid in lavender for Gods beſt children; and take in [*mors,*] is there not a death of the *body alone* as well as of *body* and *ſoul*? Did not *ſome* of the many Corinthians *ſleep* for unworthy receiving the Sacrament? dare you ſay *any* of them were *damned*? and yet [*manet mors æterna*] as their *deſert*, not their *lot* or *portion*. But for [*luctus*] who in all the world have more of *that* come to their ſhare in *this world*, then thoſe who ſhall never know what belongs to it in the *next*? So then in all this *Macarius* ſaith no more then St. *Paul*, *Leſt after I have preached to others, I my ſelf ſhould be a caſtaway.* [You ſee after what manner, or at how great a rate he feared, notwithſtanding he was an Apoſtle of God.] And I hope we call upon all the Saints of God to fear at the ſame proportion.

But the Father proceeds in the ſame place with words to this effect [For man is of that nature, that though he be fallen into a deep gulf of vice, and is become the ſervant of ſin, yet he may be converted, or turned to that which is good; and on the contrary, being the bondman of the holy Ghoſt, and overcome with the drunkenneſs of heavenly things, he may be turned back to that which is evil.] Whence you infer, that [this learned Father, who carrieth bleſſedneſs in his name, held dogmatically, and upon mature conſultation with the beſt of his underſtanding, in the myſterie of Chriſt, a poſſibility that even the beſt and higheſt raiſed Saints, may through ſloth and negligence, loſe this ſtanding, fall away and periſh.] Take this *poſſibility* as to *themſelves*, we add, if you pleaſe, an *impoſſibility of ſtanding*, when they are *moſt overcome* (as your *Macarius* words it) *with an holy drunkenneſs of heavenly things*: but ſtill they are *overruled* by the *holy ſpirit*, ſo as to be *wiſe to ſobriety*; and though they *cannot ſtand of themſelves*, they are *preſerved by the holy Ghoſt*, ſo as they ſhall not *fall away and periſh.*

The next that appears for you is [*Baſil* ſirnamed the Great.] But he ſaith as little to the point, as his fellow *Macarius*: For what if [thisbe a ſpecial difference, between the Saints in heaven, and thoſe on earth, That in *this life* the danger of falling is great, upon which account *Paul* ſaid, *Let him that ſtandeth take heed leſt he fall*; but *there*, that *is in heaven*, their ſteps are firm, life is unchangeable; there is no more danger of their being carryed away unto ſin, for neither is there any rebellion of the fleſh, &c.] I trow none of your ſilly adverſaries deny this; only *your ſubtilty* hath diſcovered a *poſſibility of the falling of the glorified Saints* and *Angels* in *heaven*, that it may the better deny the Perſeverance of the *militant Saints* on *earth*. [Not long after ſaith the ſaid *Baſil*, *Therefore we men die often before the body come to be unyoked from the ſoul; ſo that the life of men is made to be accompliſhed not only with a change in reſpect of one age ſucceeding another, but with fals of their ſouls through ſin.*] *We* readily aſſent to it, without any prejudice to our Doctrine of Perſeverance. They *fall*, it is true, but they *riſe* again. While we affirm an *impoſſibility of the Saints* SECT. 13.

perishing, we are far from asserting an *impeccability in them*, or *impossibility* of their *offending*. Cannot a man *fall* but he must needs *lie still in the dirt*?

Let us hear what [the same Father speaks yet more plainly to the business in hand; *Many* (saith he) *who had gathered much together from their youth, when they come to the middle of their years, temptations from evil spirits rising up against them, and assaulting have not bin able to bear the straitness or burthen of the winter, for want of a good Pilotship, and so have lost all.*] Confessed; but 1. of all these *many*, it appears not that *one* had *true faith*; that good Sir, is not of [*our gathering*] but *Gods inspiring*. 2. Your witness speaks not a word of *graces* in any kind, but [they who had gathered much] whether of *this vertue* or *that*, or *others*, here is not a sillable of any *spirituals*, which are more of *Gods giving* then [our gathering.]

Yea but it follows [And hence it comes to pass, that some have made shipwrack of faith.] Be it so; but the Father tels you not that he means the *grace of saving faith*; and his words will be contented with signifying a *bare profession of faith*. Now let as many others as you will [lose their *chastitie*,] that is but a *moral vertue*, and proves not that they had *faith*, such as is found in *Gods elect*, nor doth their] *fasting*, *austeerness of living*, *much praying*] after their fashion, [much weeping, continent life, *&c*] evince it better, no nor yet [their prospering by the work of the Commandments] infer it: *Works* indeed flow from *faith*, if they be such as find acceptance with God; but there are sundry *works without faith*, which as *specious* as they are in the eyes of *men*, are at best but *abominable* in the sight of *God*.

Nay but this Father hath another fling at it in words to this import, [But sin is the destroyer of that grace which is given us by the Laver of Regeneration.] Be it so; it follows not that *in those who are regenerate*, the *grace which is given them in the laver of regeneration* shall evet be *actually destroyed*. Death is the destroyer of that life which the Saints enjoy in heaven (for sure their life can no more consist with death, then that which we enjoy here on earth) can you conclude, ergo *some of the Saints in heaven shall die*. Death is the *destroyer of life*, as *sin of grace*; that is, it is the *privation of life*, whereseoever death gets possession, life is ejected; so where sin finds admission, grace is abolished. These words [Death is the destroyer of life] or sin is the destroyer of grace, shew but the opposition which death and sin carry in their nature, the one to life, the other to grace; they shew not that life or grace shall be actually destroyed by them, or that they shall enter so as to destroy life, the glory or grace in any of the elect. Nor doth that which follows evince it better [stripes go before stripping, that thou maist learn that sin goeth before the laying aside of that grace which is given unto thee by that love which the Lord beareth unto men] in *Basils* Homily upon the man that fell among thieves. Be it granted; but is *laying aside*, a *casting quite away*? yea are not some things kept the safer by being laid aside? We use to say we will lay aside a business, when we intend to prosecute it at a fitter time, not altogether to desert it. Well but [*Basil* speaks of *Pauls* travelling in birth again with his Galatians;] But saith the same *Basil*, *ergo* these Galatians were quite fallen off from grace? Yes from the doctrine of grace; it follows not from the habit of grace. Mr. *Goodwin*, as much as he *dishonours grace*, is I hope not quite *dispossest* of it.

[*Ye that are justified by the Law* (saith the Apostle) *are fallen from grace*; was any man ever *justified by the Law*? if there were, name him, and we will yield him *fallen from grace*. But if they that are *justified by the Law*, sound no more, then *they who pretend* they have no way to be *justified* but *by the Law*, then *they are fallen from grace*, in opposition to it, signifies no more then this, you are *fallen from giving that honour to the Doctrine of grace*, which you were wont to *bear*: Surely if men were *justified by the Law*, they were not *fallen from grace*, but had received a greater measure of *grace*, then the *Apostle* was aware of; no less then what *Adam* had in *innocence* could render them justifiable by the Law. Nay but [the Apostle (saith *Basil*) *adds that he refuseth not to beget them again.*] Be it so; [and *he travelled in birth till Christ were formed in them.*] *Ergo* say I, they were not *totally lost*; did the Apostles *travel in birth*, prove them *dead*; or did his *begetting them again to a new life*, prove

prove them *ſons of the ſecond death*? what cannot great Doctors make probable? Mr. *Goodwin*, who proves *Baſil* held the Galatians abſolutely *dead*, becauſe they were *begotten*; and *damned* becauſe *Chriſt was a forming in them*, may in good time prove that his Church is *increaſing* becauſe it *begins to decay*; and that it is *flouriſhing* becauſe it is *withering*; and that he is like to be the *greater Shepherd* becauſe his *lambs* run away from him, and bleat after greener paſtures. But what if St. *Paul* do πάλιν ὠδίνειν, *travel in birth again*, that ſhews his *pains* as to *death*, not their *begetting* as to a *new life*; for ſure mothers do not *travel* while the children are yet *to be begotten*, I appeal to all the good Wives in *Colemanſtreet*. Laſtly, what if [the Apoſtle travel till Chriſt be formed in them?] that ſignifies a *fuller organiſation*, not the *firſt infuſion of grace*; the ſoul is infuſed ere the body be fully faſhioned: But I liſt not trouble my ſelf or my Reader with following you any further about *Pauls Travel*. For your ſelf, *I, fuge, ſed poteris tutior eſſe domi*.

SECT. 14. After an [account taken of the judgment of the Fathers, who were ancienter then *Pelagius*] and in that reſpect ſpake, as you might have added what we readily acknowledg, ſomewhat leſs circumſpectly in this and other points, and conſequently more favourably to your Doctrine, you proceed to enquire what were the thoughts of thoſe Doctors of the Church [who either were contemporarie with *Pelagius*, or elſe took their turns of mortality after him.] For the firſt, you ſay rightly, that [*Auſtinis inſtar omnium*, in almoſt every mans eſtimate] and I allow all you add in honour of this [light of the firſt magnitude] let us trie what rayes he ſcatters for the gilding of your Doctrine. The firſt paſſage you quote is in his Book *de Corrept. & grat. cap.* 8. [*Mirandum eſt quidem, multumque mirandum, quod filiis ſuis Deus quibuſdam, quos regeneravit in Chriſto, quibus fidem, ſpem, dilectionem dedit, non dedit perſeverantiam, cum filiis alienis ſcelera tanta dimittat, atque impertita gratia ſua, faciat filios ſuos.*] Here you have *Auſtin* jumping with you, and granting that God gives not perſeverance to ſome of his children whom he hath *regenerated* and given them faith, hope, and love, and *Auſtins* marvelling at this, *that God gives not perſeverance to theſe children*, while yet he is ſo liberal of his grace as to make ſome who are guilty of fowl abominations, to be his *children*, doth the more confirm it. It is evident he was ſtedfaſtly perſwaded of the *quod ſit*, in that he was even amazed in inquiring into the *cur ſit*. And the ſecond paſſage makes it more manifeſt, as challenging his adverſaries to anſwer if they can, *Why ſeeing there are ſome who go out of the world with the goodneſs of their wils fallen from good to evil, God did not take away ſuch men from the dangers of life, whiles they yet lived faithfully and religiouſly*, that ſo ſinne and wickedneſſe might not have changed their minds or underſtandings. Cap. 6.

But you and *Auſtin* are not ſo good friends as to agree long together: For having obtained ſome words from *Auſtin*, which may ſeem to make for your advantage, you preſently repay him with a ſlur; and yielding [that God gives not perſeverance to ſome, that he gives not perſeverance to ſome, as much as he gives unto any others, whoſe deportment is but the ſame, you cannot believe, without believing him to be a reſpecter of perſons, which you muſt not at any hand believe.] And hence you ſay [it is no more, ſcarce ſo much a wonder, why God ſhould give perſeverance unto ſome of his children, and not unto others, then it is, why he ſhould ſave thoſe that believe, and not others.] I knew you could not hold long from quarrelling with *Auſtin*, two ſuch great lights of the Church muſt needs be jealous, leſt the brightneſs of one ſhould dim the other. *Auſtin* marvels *why God gives ſome perſeverance, and others not*? [you marvel no more at it, then *why he ſaves ſome, and not others.*] Marry *Auſtin* was a bungler, and could not diſcover the cauſe of this difference in Gods diſpenſation; you who are a greater Maſter in *Iſrael*, hit the nail on the head, and teach us [the different deportment of men, is the cauſe why God gives one perſeverance, and not another;] and ſo God makes not the difference, but the men themſelves.

2. Well but albeit you are pleaſed to allow *Auſtin*, that *God gives not perſeverance*

to ſome, while he doth to others; yet I doubt, whether you hold in earneſt, that *God gives perſeverance to any*: Speak out, doth God, if he give perſeverance to any, give it them while they deport themſelves well, or while ill? if you ſay, while *ill*, then belike he gives them *perſeverance in good, while they deport themſelves ill*, makes the *well* perſevere in *whiteneſs* while they are as *black* as a *cole*; if while *well*, then he gives them *perſeverance, after they have perſeverance*, gives them what they *have already*: and this is, I wis, the ſenſe of your profound Doctrine: But further, whenever *God gives them perſeverance*, doth he doe it *before their death*, or in the *very nick* of it? if in the *nick* of it, then he gives them perſeverance in *indiviſibili*; and what kind of perſeverance, I pray, is that, which is not *long enough to laſt for any ſpace*, but inſtead of being *extended according to time*, is knit up in the more vigorous permanency of a *ſingle inſtant*? If *before their death*, then doth he give them this *perſeverance, altogether*, or *not*; if *not altogether*, then he gives them not *perſeverance unto death*, without which, no *perſeverance* can ſtead them; if *altogether*, then he gives them perſeverance *unto death*, before they come to it, and ſo they may be ſaid to *perſevere to death*, a conſiderable number of years *before the end of their lives*; this is as good, as that *the things that are not yet in being, were made and perfected by an act from eternity*. It is clear, you oppoſe *Auſtin* in his *wonder* at the *cur ſit*, however you pretend he complies ſo far with you in the *quod ſit* of his aſſertion. But let us trie whether *Auſtin* be more of *your mind*, notwithſtanding all he hath ſaid in the *quod ſit*, then you are of his, as to the *cur ſit*. For this, ſure I am he expreſly oppoſeth your conceit of the Cauſe, why *God gives not perſeverance to ſome*, viz. *becauſe of their worſe deportment*, and that he *gives it to others becauſe of their better deportment*. *Voluntas quippe humana* (ſaith he) *non libertate conſequitur gratiam, ſed gratiâ potius libertatem; & ut perſeveret delectabilem perpetuitatem, & inſuperabilem fortitudinem.* Cap. 8. *de corrept. & Gratia.* For *that*, we are to ſee whether his words will infer your intent. A *falling away*, I grant he acknowledgeth, even of *ſuch as have been regenerated in Chriſt*, and *have had faith, hope, and love*; but I hope he denies *the falling away of any Elect*, by your own and *Voſſius* his confeſſion: Now what if he would have ſaid that theſe very perſons, of whom he ſpeaks, were *elect*? then belike he muſt contradict himſelf, or grant a *falling away of elect men*. Hear him then, *Quis neget hos electos, cum credunt, & baptizantur, & ſecundum Deum vivunt, plane dicuntur electi, à neſcientibus quid futuri ſint, non ab illo, qui eos novit non habere perſeverantiam, quæ ad beatam vitam perducat electos; ſcitque illos ita ſtare ut præſciret eſſe caſuros.* What he ſaith of *electi*, may be as well ſaid of *credentes, pii &c. qui non cognoſcitur eſſe malus præſumitur eſſe bonus*. Shortly then, as men were bound to look on theſe, ſo as not to preſume to hold them other then *elect*; ſo too, not to dare to account them other then *believers* and *godly*; yet ſtil they were as *not elect*, ſo neither *believers* nor *godly* in *themſelves*, or the ſight of *God*; and then *Auſtin* in all this, hath ſpoken but of ſuch as *ſeemed believers* and *godly* to *men*, were not *really ſuch*, or looked on as ſuch by *God*; and if theſe be ſaid to *fall away*, what makes it to the prejudice of *our Doctrine*, or wherein doth *Auſtin* contradict either us or himſelf?

But there is ſomewhat elſe that is obſervable, that you have furniſhed me with an anſwer for *Auſtin* and our ſelves: It is this [God (ſay you) gave not theſe that fell, perſeverance, becauſe their deportment was not as good as theirs to whom he gives perſeverance] *Ergo*, as great a flouriſh as theſe who fell made, there was it ſeems ſome *rottenneſs* at the *core*; and though their goodneſs were ſuch as ſhewed *fair*, it was not *right*; and then they were called *pii*, and *credentes*, only by men, who knew not their hearts, but were nothing leſs in *themſelves*, and the eyes of *him before whom all things are naked and open*. So that this device of *Gods not giving ſome men perſeverance, and giving it to others, becauſe of a difference in their deportment*, inſtead of prejudicing the honour of *Gods free grace*, on which ſervice it would fain have ſpent it ſelf, hath unawares helped to diſcover the *ſecret falſeneſs* of ſome *glaring kinds of holyneſs*; and ſhewed how *theſe holy men* may *fall*, and yet *all true Saints* ſtand nothing the leſs, that *all* that *we* call in our common *charity*, *Regenerate* and

Juſtified,

Justified, the *Children of God*, and the like, are not *such indeed*; and that though they be in the *faith of children*, viz. the *profession* of that faith, they are not such in *truth and reality*. And this makes it needless for me to say more to any other passages you produce out of *Austin*, for all which you may say thanks to *Vossius*, to whom you are pleased to refer us for the judgment of *Prosper*, *Salvian*, *Gregory* the great, *Isidor Hispalensis*, and other the best Writers after *Augustin*. Of all which we shall say but this, That if *their words* sound as *Austins*, *our answer* to *Austins* words, will serve *theirs*.

You come next to [bewail the over-hot and confident zeal, wherewith the Doctrine of Apostasie, so generally received in former ages, hath been as highly opposed in latter times, by a great party of the Reformers of Religion] and you are pleased to impute it to [their over-hasty and precipitant carriage, wherein that befell them, which usually doth sweepers of houses, or purgers of bodies, they unawares cast out much good, while they mean only to eject that which is naught.] These are *words*, and that is all. Till you have proved this Doctrine of Apostasie to be a *Pearl*, we shall not take the pains to seek it among the *rubbish*, and till you have proved the humour of the defenders *pin* to be *found*, we shall not need trouble our selves to examin the Groom of the Stool over-curiously about it. *Transeat cum cæteris erroribus.* We humbly conceive, that albeit sundry *pins* may be swept up in the *dust*, yet but few *points* that are either tagged with *gold* or *silver*, especially precious stones in them: only I cannot but observe, that you help *all the errors* which this day endeavour to find new footing among us, to a *common Apologie*. The Reformers were transported with an inconsiderate zeal, swept out many a *precious Jewel* among the *dust*, cast many a *pure humour* into the *draught*, yea banished many a *beautifull truth*, while they made mutton of sundry *misconceptions falsehoods*. The Doctrine of the *lawfulness of worshipping Images*, the *Hoste*, *praying to Saints*, the *Blessed Lady*, *Virgin Mother*, and almost every point of Popery, may plead this, as well as your *Doctrine of Apostasie*. This plea is too common to be considerable; only we may learn hence, how much all the errors rejected by the Reformers, must acknowledg themselves indebted to Mr. *Goodwin*. SECT. 15.

And yet as all those errors are singularly obliged to *you* for this Courtesie, so hath the Doctrine of Apostasie, as you pretend [leis to except then most of its fellows] against those hastie Reformers [the Lutherans] whom you will have [no way inferior to the Calvinists] giving it, as you adde [very fair respect and protection.] And truly in this, you are confessed to say much truth. SECT. 16.

But 1. What if the Lutherans be content to allow it, and which is more, to maintain it? so do they *Consubstantiation*, the *ubiquity of Christs body*, &c. Have you, or I, reason to think the better of these *Points* for their *Patrons*, and not rather the worse of the *Patrons* for the *Points*?

Yet 2. Let us see whether the passages which you produce out of two famous Doctors of that School, will come home to the point.

1. then, saith *Melancthon*, *Refutandi sunt duo errores fanaticorum hominum.* Certainly his meekness did not intend *Calvin* and his Disciples by that name. [*qui finxerunt renatos non posse labi*] that concerns not us: [*Et quamvis labantur contra conscientiam, tamen justos esse.*] This concerns us as little or less. [*Hæc amentia damnanda est, & opponenda exempla, & dicta, scripturæ, Prophetica, & Apostolica, ut* Saul, *&* David, *placuerunt Deo, fuerunt justi, & donati spiritu sancto, tamen postea lapsi sunt; ita ut alter prorsus perierit, alter rursus ad Deum conversus sit.* Loc. de Pœnitentiâ.]

Here I observe 1. the error confuted [*Renati, quamvis labantur contra conscientiam, tamen justos esse.*] And for the explication of it, I might distinguish 1. of [*labi contra conscientiam*, 2. *justos esse.*] And accordingly affirm, 1. that [*Renati*] may fall sometimes, *contra conscientiam* in smaller matters, that is, their conscience plucking them back, or at least ready to do it, if awake, and yet remain just in respect of Gods *not imputing* their sins to them, though the least sin deserve from the just hand of God, no less then the insufferable load of *eternal misery*.

2. That

2. That *Melanct hon* means not to condemn this as an error of fanatique men, but *another conceit* which is many a note above it, to wit, that of some Anabaptists, that *men being once regenerate, may break all Laws*, decrie all *duties*, despise all *Ordinances* of God and man, renounce all *conscience*, and yet forsooth do *not sin in all this*; it is their prerogative to be *above* the challenge for *sin*. God is so much *theirs*, that they may be Devils, and yet have all in *heaven* safe enough. Christ hath *purchased* a place for them, they cannot be in danger of being *kept* out for *any* sin, he having *satisfied* for *all*. This is just the Doctrine of our Ranters, and such as these doth *Melanct hon* brand, and that worthily, as fanatique. 2. Consider we the confutation, and 1. this shews that *Melanct hon* disputes against such as hold no need of Repentance, but that their sins continuing to the *last*, they shall be *saved*, else what need he mention *Sauls* perishing, and *Davids* returning? but only to shew that *Saul* not *repenting*, did *perish*, that *David* who did *not perish*, was fain to *repent*: and therefore they are madly mistaken, who think that those who are *once Renati*, are so righteous and just, that they may *sin at pleasure*, and need not *repent* of it; which you sometimes are pleased to fasten upon your adversaries.

2. Now whereas *Melanct hon* saith, that [*Saul* had the holy Ghost given unto him, yet afterwards fell, so that he perished utterly;] which seems to be point blank contrary to our Doctrine.

I answer, That *Melanct hon* speaks but *ad hominem* only to the fanatical persons, against whom he sets himself. Thus *Saul* had the holy Ghost *more* then *their Saints*, and yet *fell* and *perished*, ergo *their best Saints* have *as much cause* to *fear perishing*, although many of them do presume upon *their having the holy Ghost*, to *sin* without *remorse* or *regret*, as if forsooth they might *sin*, yet not *offend*. And that this is his meaning, appears by what you add next out of him,

[These and the like sayings being spoken of regenerate men, *Testantur posse eos labi, & lapsos contra conscientiam non placere Deo, nisi rursus convertantur.*] What use of this *posse eos labi*, but that he bends his speech against such, as held they could not as much as *labi*, though they did *ruere* into all manner of wickedness, not *sin*, forsooth, though they trampled under foot all the *Laws* both of God and man? And it is further confirmed by what follows in your succeeding quotation, [*Cum dictum sit in renatis manere peccatum, necesse est tradi discrimen, num hos qui ruunt in delicta contra conscientiam, certum est non manere in gratia, nec retinere fidem, justitiam, spiritum sanctum.*] Observe his words, he allows *sin doth remain in a regenerate man*; he denies a *regenerate man remains in sin*, so as to *rush* in *delicta*, not *one*, but *many*, *any*. They who contend for such a precious priviledg for the Saints, that they may *sin without sorrow*, being under *grace*, are the men whom *Melanct hon* opposeth in these passages.

And indeed in the last place which you quote out of him, he expresly sets himself against them, by name, Anabaptists, charging them with both these Doctrines, only at last, I confess, he shews himself to be as it were of your mind against us, that *some who have true faith, fall away so as never to return*; but what he means by *true faith*, whether the *profession* of the *true faith*, or the *true embracing* of the *faith professed*, is not so clear, nor is it material. We might allow you *Melanct hon* was of your opinion without any great danger, yet saith he, the Doctrine *de incertitudine salutis*, is no better then *Ethnica & reipsa delet Evangelium. Mel. disp. de penit.* 1548. 8. *Octob.* in 2. *Tom. Lutheri.*

Now for *Chemnitius*, let us trie whether the words you cite out of him will weigh more then those of *Melanct hon*.

As for *Chemnitius*, 1. you confess he speaks the words you quote out of him, after [mention of a Tridentine argument against assurance of salvation pretended from the Scriptures] which *he answers*. Now how he should oppose the Tridentine Doctrine against *assurance of salvation*, and yet deny *our Doctrine* of the *perseverance of the Saints*, is a mystery.

2. The words which you quote from him, carry nothing against it: For what if [*the Scriptures and experience teach, that many do not persevere but fall from grace*]

We

We say the same, only we distinguish of *grace*: And what he adds is less against us. [*But this cometh not from hence, or because God is not willing to preserve or keep those to the end, whom he hath once received into his grace or favour.*] *Ergo* according to *Chemnitius*, he is *willing*, and if willing, I hope he is *able*, and therefore they *shall be preserved, quo semel in gratiam recepit*, if you understand *grace* aright. [*But from hence*, viz. *because many shed, or spill the holy Ghost, and shake or dash faith out of their hearts by security, diffidence, and works of the flesh.*] That indeed is the cause why they fall who have not the *especial grace* of the spirit of God; but wherever *that* is, it prevents such *security* and *diffidence*, and keeps men from committing, or at least from *continuing* in the *works of the flesh*. Now what though he say afterwards that [*Such Scriptures as these, Let him that thinks he standeth, take heed lest he fall; Work out your salvation with fear and trembling, be monitory unto men, lest through a perswasion of the certainty of salvation, they degenerate into security, whereby faith it self is chocked, and quite put out.*]

There is nothing here, I hope, against *perswasion of the certainty of salvation*, but only against the *abuses* which the *flesh* is apt to make of such a *perswasion*; and we yield there is *that* in the *best man*, which is apt to draw the *most pestilent juice* out of the *choicest flowers*. There is nothing here against our Doctrine, for our Doctrine *forbids men* to *waste* it so unworthily, and to draw, as their corruptions are too forward, such wretched *Corollaries* from it. Will you say the Apostle was out, when he averred that *Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound*, because some were ready to say, *Let us do evil, that good may come of it*; or that the Apostle in giving a check to this their witless *inference*, did retract *his own Doctrine*? Let *Chemnitius* say that [*By carnal security, faith is chocked, and quite put out, and faith extinguished,*] *we* say as much; but still deny that *carnal security shall prevail so far*, as to chock, and put out the saving grace of faith. We may well affirm that darkness doth chock light even at noon, that is, the light cannot consist with darkness; and yet deny as justly, that as long as the Sun shines in its strength, there can be any danger of such darkness as to bury its light: So is it rightly said of *Chemnitius*, that [*unless we abide in the goodness of God, we shall be cut off,*] *Paul* saith as much, yet will not bid us deny the continuance of *Gods goodness*, to keep us from being *cut off*; *he abideth faithfull, and cannot deny himself.* What if *Chemnitius* say [*Faith abideth not in those who indulge vitious and depraved affections?*] We say so too, *shew us* (as *James*) *your faith by your works.* But may still avouch, that whereever *true faith* is, it *will abide*, so as to make men *abhor such vitious indulgence.*

Hitherto *Chemnitius* is not against us: Nor is he more our adversary in the next passage; for that being but a piece of his discourse against the Papists, denying the Church-Widows had *liberty to marry*, and pretending their marrying was a forsaking their *first faith*, i.e. their *engagement* forsooth, *not to marry again*, he only goes about to prove that the *faith* there spoken of, is not to be construed in the Popish sense, but that it signifies either the *Doctrine of faith*, or at most the *habit*: and though these examples are such as reach no farther then the *Doctrine*, yet I grant he is chiefly for the *habit*; but then he shews what is *destructive of it*, not that that which is so destructive, shall ever *prevail over true faith.* He only shews how *true faith cannot consist with a denying of the foundation, or continued practice of wickedness*; and so if it were in them before, must upon such obstinate denying of the foundation or persisting in wicked practises, be yielded for lost, and so be looked upon by themselves and others. *Chemnitius* and we are agreed: and I pray have recourse to a passage or two which I shall quote in my answer to your 23 Section of this Chapter, and you will see, we need not fear you will be able to make any great quarrel between us.

I readily grant you, you might easily make the pile of these Testimonies much larger; but withall I observe that you are fain to take these ships which fall from them, doing *other work*, but cannot tell how to produce any of the Ancient Doctors of the Lutheran party, writings set, and just discourses in defence of your Assertion.

And surely they are at least the more considering men of them to be thought to be generally against it, for they dispute *de certitudine fidei*, against the Papists, tooth and

nail,

nail. Now how *certitudo fidei* can ſtand without *certitudo ſalutis*, or *certitudo ſalutis* without *certitudo perſeverantiæ*, would be very well worth the learning. *Stapleton acriter hoc urget* (as Dr. *Prideaux* obſerveth) againſt them, and indeed as juſtly, if they held that men might be *certain* of their *ſalvation*, and yet their *perſeverance* be *uncertain*; but by your leave they affirm, that the perſeverance of the *elect* is ſure, and that the *elect* may be ſure of their perſeverance; nor doth Dr. *Prideaux* in this *Lect. de certitudine*, do more then alleadg *Stapletons* preſſing them with this abſurdity, he doth not ſay the Lutherans are guilty of it: And howbeit he ſay ſomewhat more in his *Lecture de perſev.* yet that is but *this*, that the *Pſeudo-Lutherans* deny perſeverance, and that in this *turpiter à præceptore deficiunt*, yea and that they deny ſo, only as to affirm a total, but not a final Apoſtaſie of the Saints, that he ſaith they yield. And I am ſure, *Gerhard* diſputes it at large, ſo doth *Brochman*, take theſe paſſages for a taſte.

1. For *Gerhard*, by the ſame token he laies this for his ground, *Quorum fides non defecit de perſeverantia certi eſſe poſſunt.* He quotes a paſſage out of the Canon Law, *Quorum fides quæ per delectionem & amorem operatur omnino non deficit, aut ſi qui ſint quorum deficit, reparatur antequam vitaiſta finiatur, & deleta quæ intercurrerat iniquitate ad finem perſeverantiæ deputatur. Can. firmum diſt. 2. depen.*

See *Gerhard Confeſſ. Cathol. lib. 2. part. 3. art. 23. cap. 5.* by whom are quoted,

Bernard.	*Almericus Gallus ex Vincentio.*
Joh. Gerſon.	*Johannes Weſſelius.*
Enchiria. Colonienſe.	*Catech. Romanus.*
Jacobus Valdius.	*Claudius Guillandus.*
Cenſura Colonienſ. Dial. 4.	*Geo. Caſſander.*
Jac. Sadoletus ex Rivio.	*Alph. de Caſtro.*
Anton. Marinarius,	*Amb. Catharinus.*
Pet. Suavis.	*Peſantius. Johannes Ferus.*
Cornel. Muſſus.	*Mart. Eyſengren.*
Petrus de Ribaden.	*Ben. Pererius.*
Bellarmin.	*Greg. de Valent.*
Adam. Tanner.	*Cornelius à Lapide.*
Coſterus, &c.	

All as concurring with him in this Point of Certainty.

By this Catalogue the Reader may ſee how eaſie it is to muſter up names, and how little learning will ſerve to ſtuff out a whole Volume with quotations.

Then farther, *Ger. Conf. Cath. lib. 2. par. 3., art. 22. p. 514.* Where he propoſeth an Argument againſt himſelf thus, *De perſev. nemo poteſt eſſe certus, ergo nec de elect.*

And anſwers, *Reſp. ex Salm. tom. 8. tract. 19. p. 149. Hic ſcrupulus vincendus eſt fide tanti Regis (Chriſti) & ſalutis noſtræ ſitientiſſimi. vide.*

And for *Brochman*, howbeit yon ſay Dr. *Prideaux* coupleth the Lutherans with the Remonſtrants or Arminians (who yet are only *Pſeudo-Lutherans*) yet whatever Dr. *Prideaux* doth, *Brochman*, a Lutheran much eſteemed by Dr. *Prideaux*, doth in this very particular couple the Papiſts and Arminians together, *Cui Arminianorum & Pontificiorum Dogmati longe periculoſiſſimo varia opponimus argumenta. 1. Deum arguit mendacii. 2. E Diametro pugnat cum ſine Revelata doctrina de prædeſtinatione æterna ad ſalutem. De Prad. q. 8. & Cap. 1. Sect. 4. de elect. certitud. rotundo ore confirmat Chriſtus.*

Yet let them all run that way, we are not ſolicitous to follow them; we humbly conceive they are never the *better reformed*, for keeping this piece of old Romiſh *leaven*, and it is as facile for us to ſay that the Lutheran Reformers had not *leaſure* enough to *ſweep out all the duſt*, as it was for you to ſay that the Calviniſts (as ſome pleaſe to entitle them) did in their *haſte* ſweep out *ſundry pearls with the duſt*. If the

Doctrine

Doctrine of Apoſtaſie be a *pearl*, yet there is many a piece of *glaſs* that is better. Sir, we look on the Doctrine of Perſeverance, as one of the choiceſt *Jewels* in the Churches *Cabinet*, as that which *quickens* the dulneſs, *cures* the ſadneſs, *fortifies* the reſolutions of the Saints; and howbeit you ſay theſe are [importune and ſenſeleſs acclamations to it, and that it is but a ſuperſtitious ignorance and weakneſs, that doth this devotion to it;] yet we regardleſs what nicknames you pleaſe to honour us with, profeſs to owe the Doctrine of Perſeverance, for ſo much ſweet comfort in the midſt of heavie temptations, and ſeaſonable encouragement to holy duties, that we have reaſon to bleſs God for thoſe *precious promiſes* of *keeping us through faith to ſalvation*, which this Doctrine inſiſts on, as a *chief means* whereby he keeps us from *defiling our ſelves with all filthineſs of the fleſh and ſpirit*. May others look upon it as [a Pillow of Satans making,] we profeſs it to be rather Gods *bell* to awaken us to a holy carefulneſs. The *fleſh* hath no encouragement from this Doctrine to *reſt*; the tenor of it being, that the *fleſh* ſhall be curbed all along, and at laſt *conſumed*, in as many as have the *ſpirit*. May others look upon it as a [Doctrine unworthy the purity, holineſs, wiſdom, and unpartial integrity of God,] they ſhew *their miſtake*; *He that hath this hope, purifieth himſelf even as God is pure.*

You proceed to ſhew, that [Thoſe who make one ſhoulder with *Calvin* to lift up the ſame body, or frame of Doctrine with him, though they ordinarily, or at leaſt frequently, oppoſe the Lutheran ſenſe, in the Point of Perſeverance, yet are neceſſitated, whatever be the matter or cauſe of it, to ſpeak things of a clear and perfect conſonancy with it.] SECT. 19.

And firſt you begin with [*Calvin*, who ſaith of the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, *Laudat quod bene caperint, ſed ne pretextu gratiæ, quam conſequuti ſunt, carnis indulgeant ſecuritati, dicit opus eſſe perſeverantiâ.*] I trow we all ſay the ſame. 1. Did ever any of your weak adverſaries ſay Perſeverance was a *needleſs thing*? If they *thought ſo*, why contended they ſo earneſtly that *God keeps his Saints*, ſo as to make them perſevere in *faith* and *holineſs*? if their perſeverance were *needleſs*, they *needed not* trouble themſelves ſo much in *diſputing for it*.

Secondly, Did ever any ſay that *ſecurity is not apt to ſteal upon the beſt Saints*, and *that under a pretence of that grace which they have received*? We yield the *fleſh* is apt to catch advantages to it ſelf, from the graces of the *ſpirit*; only the *ſpirit* makes the Saints the *more carefull*, the more they are ſenſible how prone they are, if left to *themſelves*, to become *ſecure*. Well but [*Calvin* goes on, *Nam plerique delibato tantum evangelio, quaſi ad ſummum pervenerint, de profectu non cogitant.*] Too true; but it fares with them in matters of *holineſs*, as *Seneca* obſerved, it did with ſome others in matters of *wiſdom*, *Ad ſapientiam perveniſſent, niſi ſe perveniſſe credidiſſent.* But this is ſo with thoſe only [*qui delibarunt tantum evangelium*] and licked ſo little of it, that they have taſted only ſome few *obvious truths* of it, and ſcarce that. Now let him add, [*Ita fit, ut in non medio modo ſtadio, adeoque prope ipſos carceres deſideant, ſed alio vertunt curſum ſuum.*] And we grant it, of too too many. *Negari non poteſt, Celari non debet.* This preſent age hath yielded too many examples of ſuch who have run ſo uncertainly, and not only *ſate down*, but *turned quite a contrary way*. We have the patience to tranſcribe the reſt, which you quote out of *Calvin*. [*Specioſa quidem eſt iſta objectio, Quid ultra volumus; poſtquam adepti ſumus Chriſtum? Verum ſi fide poſſidetur, in ea perſtandum eſt, ut nobis perpetua maneat poſſeſſio. Ergo hac lege ſe nobis fruendum dedit Chriſtus, ut eadem, qua in ejus participationem admiſſi ſumus, fide, tantum bonum conſervemus uſque ad mortem.*] *Calv.* in *Heb.* 3. 14. What make you of this? Why [the conditionality of perſeverance in the Saints, yea the non-perſeverance of ſome of them, cannot lightly be aſſerted in terms more ſignificant and expreſs; to tell men that *they muſt perſiſt in faith*, to *make the poſſeſſion of Chriſt perpetual unto them*; and to inform them withall that God will by an irreſiſtible hand of power, make, or conſtrain them to *perſiſt in faith*, is to tie plummets of lead to a mans heels, to make him run the faſter.]

But firſt, I find no *Conditionality of perſeverance* in theſe words of *Calvin*,

but perseverance rather set forth as a *Condition of salvation*: He speaks not of *faith*, I hope, as a *Condition of persevering in faith*, but of *persevering in faith*, as a *condition of possessing Christ*, or the *benefits* purchased by Christ to *eternity*.

Secondly, what may he not tell men, tho *they must persist in faith to make the possession of Christ perpetual unto them*, and ad withall, that God will by an irresistible hand of power, *make* them to *persist* in faith? I am deceived, if God tell not men that they must have *new hearts*, if they will be eternally happie, and yet withall informs them that he will *make them new hearts*, and *keep* them that *they shall not depart from him*.

This is not [like lead tied to mens heels] which would *hinder* them, but as *lead* tied to a *C locks wheels*, which makes them *run the faster*: Tell God, you had best, that he *forgat himself*, when to *encourage* his people in the *waies* of his *Commandments*, he informs them *he will order* it, that they shall *not depart from him*: It is some *quick-silver* in your nimbler head, that talks of this [*Lead* at men heels to make them run the faster.]

But 3. *Calvin* speaks not *upon the place*, of Gods *irresistible hand of power*, as [*making*] and *no where* as [*constraining*] his Saints to persist in faith.

4. In short, You do not here alleadg *Calvin*, as *asserting the Doctrine of Apostasie*, but only shew how silly soul he miserably *contradicts* his dear *Doctrine of Perseverance*, by a thing called *Consequence*, whereof poore man he was not aware.

But 2. In the next passage you catch this same *John Calvin*, at a hop of greater advantage. [*Nunc videas quosnam à spe venia excludat, nempe Apostatas, qui se à Christi Evangelio, quod prius amplexerant, & à Dei gratia, alienarunt, quod nemini contingit, nisi qui peccet in spiritum sanctum.*] What follows as you worthily mention it? [*Nec certe Deus alios, ita gratia sua spoliat nisi Reprobos, ut illis nihil faciat residuum.*] Make as much of this as you can against the *perseverance of the elect*. When *Reprobi* may be Englished *Elect*, possibly you may be a *saver* by this *costly quotation*, which runs on thus, [*Si quis roget cur talis Apostasiæ mentionem hic faceat Apostolus, cum fideles compellet, qui* procul aberant à tam scelerata perfidia.] I wonder whether *that too*; contribute any thing towards the proof of the Apostasie of the Saints? [*Respondeo, maturè abeo indicari periculum, ut sibi præcaveant. Quod notatu operæ pretium est, nam cum arctâ viâ defleximus, non tantum excusamus apud alios vitia nostra, sed nobis quoque ipsis imponimus.*] Right; and therefore is there the more need of such seasonable *cautions*, against the danger of *backsliding*, and these *cautions* are used by God, as *means* to prevent our *backslidings*, and make *less backslidings*, preventions of *greater*; and such as [*Calvin* here saith] *none but the Reprobate are guilty of*, which it seems proves him a *secret friend* to the *Doctrine of Apostasie*. And he is so fond of it, good man, that he cannot hold from opening himself more fully in its behalf, as much as it reflects to his own dishonour. [In his Comment upon *Mat.* 24. 13. where he hath words to this purpose, *Although the love of many being surcharged with the weight of iniquities shall fall, yet Christ admonisheth that this obstacle also must be overcome; lest those that are faithfull, being tired out with evil examples, should start back: Therefore he repears that saying, that none shall be saved but he that shall strive lawfully, so as to persevere.*]

What I wis are these *evil examples*, with which the faithfull are apt to be *tyred* out? *The Examples of such* as having *pretended love, decline to uncharitableness, and infidelity, are apt to tyre the faithfull*, how? *by suggesting a fear that they shall decline after the example of others Apostasie.*

Now saith *Calvin*, *This obstacle also must be overcome*, that is, *this fear of falling, as others have done*, which douhtless makes exceedingly for the *Doctrine of Apostasie*. You see here, this *fear of falling* is to be *overcome* that they may *stand*, that this *fear of falling* may be *overcome*: he saith Christ repeats that saying, *that none should be saved, but he that strives lawfully*. But how doth *this help to overcome that fear*, unless there were *somewhat else supposed*, viz. *that if they were truly faithfull they shall be enabled to strive lawfully, and to persevere to the end*? The *needfulness* of their *perseverance*, without some *ground* of the *certainty* of their perseverance, would *never*

overcome

overcome that *obſtacle*, which our Saviour endeavours to *remove out of the way*. But *Calvin* not ſatisfied to expreſs himſelf in this peaceable and calm way, as a cordial well-wiſher to your Doctrine of Apoſtaſie [in his Commentaries upon the Epiſtle to the Galatians, he in a warlike manner, [bids defiance to his own Doctrine of Perſeverance once in theſe words, *Arguit enim eos defectionis, non à ſua Doctrina tantum, ſed à Chriſto. Nam Chriſtum tenere aliter non poterant, quam ſi agnoſcerent, ejus beneficio nos manumiſſos eſſe à ſervitute legis.* Calv. in Gal. 1.6.]

This Teſtimony, ſay you [Cannot be eluded with this accuſtomed put-off, *viz.* that he ſpeaks not of falling away from true faith, but from the Doctrine of faith, or from the profeſſion of faith, becauſe he ſaith, the Apoſtle convinceth them, or reproveth them for falling away from *Chriſt himſelf*, which is every way as much, if not ſomewhat more then falling away from *true faith*.] Why but may not men *follow* Chriſt, and ſo *fall* from him, without *true faith*? I think *Judas* will not be proved in haſte to have had *true faith* becauſe he *followed* Chriſt, and much leſs becauſe he *fell* from him. There is many a man *follows* Chriſt for other commodities then his *miracles*, and is led by the *faſhion* rather then his *faith*.

1. Men fall away from *Chriſt himſelf*, when from profeſſing his Doctrine, ſtiled *Chriſt*, Eph. 4. *Ye have not ſo learned Chriſt*.

2. Men *fall away* from *Chriſt himſelf* when they *fall off* from communion with his *Church*, ſtiled *Chriſt*; 1 Cor. 12. *Many goe out from us; that were never of us*.

And 3. Why may not men be ſaid *to fall away from Chriſt himſelf*, when they fall from the *love* they did bear, and do owe to any *ſervant of Chriſt*? What is done to ſuch a one, Chriſt accounts as done to *himſelf*; and ſo the *falling away* from *ſuch a one*, as the *falling from Chriſt himſelf*. Whether this *Himſelf*, have any extraordinary Emphaſis, I know not, but ſure it is not in the *Latine*; only you might have made a little more of theſe words of *Calvin*, *Chriſt* being oppoſed to *his Doctrine*; *Non à ſua doctrina tantum ſed à Chriſto*; but then *ſuâ* helps the matter, and carries this in it, that *Pauls Doctrine* was not *his own* but *Chriſts*, and a falling away from *Pauls Doctrine*, was no leſs then a falling from *Chriſt himſelf*: Whereas you gravely ſubjoyn, that [it is not to be ſuppoſed that *Calvin* himſelf, holding that the Apoſtle charged them with falling away from Chriſt, ſhould hold that they had not thus fallen away, this being no leſs then to charge the Apoſtle with charging the Galatians untruely.] It is true indeed, if *Calvin* hold that the Galatians *fell not away from Chriſt in that ſenſe wherein the Apoſtle chargeth them to have fallen away*; but he may both *deny them* to have *fallen in your ſenſe*, and yet grant they *fell* in the *Apoſtles ſenſe*, without any ſuch parlous contradiction.

Well but [Beſides, ſaying that they could not *tenere Chriſtum, i. e.* retain, or keep their hold or poſſeſſion of Chriſt, but upon ſuch and ſuch terms, he plainly ſuppoſeth that a preſent hold or poſſeſſion of Chriſt may be loſt.] Yes; but the queſtion will be, *What* [preſent hold or poſſeſſion of Chriſt?] *what* is meant by *Chriſt*? *what* by the *hold* or *poſſeſſion* of *Chriſt*? whether this [*tenere Chriſtum*] be as much as to *poſſeſs Chriſt*? and that the word will not be ſatisfied with *profeſſe* Chriſt: *tenere* is not uſed in the *Schools*, as it is in the *Courts*, for to *have* and to *hold*; but a *Tenet* is no more then a *Point of Doctrine*, and *tenere Chriſtum*, or *cum Chriſto*, ſounds no more then a *profeſſion* of his *Doctrine*, not a *poſſeſſion* of his *ſpirit*. And methinks theſe words, [*Chriſtum tenere aliter non poterant, quam ſi agnoſcerent &c.*] ſeem to intimate, wherein their *tenere* conſiſted, *viz.* in *agnoſcere*: and laſtly I am not ſatisfied, that [*Chriſtum aliter tenere non poterant*] ſignifies that they *did actually hold Chriſt in any ſenſe*. If Mr. *Goodwin* can prove, that he who *cannot hold a thing but upon ſuch or ſuch terms*, doth *actually hold it without thoſe terms*, he will doe more then all the ſubtile Sophiſters in *Weſtminſter* Hall will doe all the next Term, though it were twice as long as it is, let them wrangle never ſo much about it: All the *ſervientes* may be [*manumiſſi*] from their [*ſervitute legis*] and Mr. *Goodwin* take their room at the Bar. I ſee he can prove, that a man who *cannot hold* his Eſtate, hath it *faſt and ſure*, to all intents and purpoſes.

[Elſewhere (ſay you) in the ſame Epiſtle] you mean Comment on it [the ſame Doctrine goes to wrack, by the Pen of the great Patron, or founder rather of it in theſe words, *The meaning is, if you ſeek for any part, or piece of righteouſneſs, in the works of the Law, Chriſt becomes nothing to you, and you aliens from grace. For their opinion was not ſo groſs, as that they thought they ſhould be juſtified by the alone obſervation of the Law, but they mingled Chriſt with the Law. Otherwiſe* Paul *ſhould have had no ground to have terrified them, with ſuch threatnings as theſe, What do you mean? you take a courſe to make Chriſt unprofitable to you; you bring his grace to nothing. Thus then we ſee, that we cannot place, no not the leaſt part of our righteouſneſs in the Law, but we renounce Chriſt and his grace.*]

I cannot diſcern how the Doctrine of Perſeverance, is in any danger from theſe words; which proceeding by way of *ſuppoſition* do not *aſſert* any thing *de facto*. You may as well inferr, that when I ſay, *If Mr.* Goodwins *Book be unanſwerable*, and his *Churches judgment upon it infallible, the common Doctrine of Perſeverance is like to fall, ſo as never to riſe again*, I aſſert the *fall* of this *Doctrine*, whiles I am labouring to *ſupport* it. Yea but [1. *Renunciation* hath no place but in ſuch things as were formerly, either held, practiſed, or poſſeſt; therefore if men renounce Chriſt and his Grace, they formerly held, practiſed, or poſſeſt it: be it ſo, in *profeſſion*, and now they *renounce* that they *profeſſed* before, to *owe Chriſt* and *his grace alone* for *their righteouſneſs*. Now they *renounce* what they *formerly profeſſed*, they aſcribe not ſo much honour as they formerly did, to Chriſt and his grace; but even *when they profeſſed moſt to honour Chriſt and his grace*, they might do it but from *their teeth*, as we ſay, not from their *hearts*. [2. Nor can the *grace of Chriſt* be ſaid to be brought to *nothing*, in reference unto any man unto whom it was never *any thing*;] yes, if it *would have been ſomewhat to him*. As for inſtance, when I ſay, *you will if you do this, make ſuch an act of grace*, ſuppoſe a *general pardon unprofitable*, and bring it to *nothing*. Further, Sir, grace doth not ſignifie only *grace inherent in us*, but as I may ſay, *grace offered to us*, a *favour* which *we ſhould receive*, as well as a *change of heart which we do enjoy*; and ſo much you take notice of in your next words, [He that never had, or enjoyed the *grace, favour*, or *good will* of *Chriſt*, cannot by any courſe or practice whatſoever, be ſaid to bring it to nothing;] but he that enjoyed but an *opportunity* of enjoying the grace, favour, or good will of Chriſt, muſt acknowledg that *opportunity*, a *grace* and *favour*; and bringing that *opportunity* to *nothing*, may well be ſaid to *bring the grace, favour*, or *goodwill* of Chriſt to *nothing*, albeit he never enjoyed more then an *opportunity of enjoying* it, which was indeed a *grace*, but not that which he *might have enjoyed*, had he husbanded that *opportunity*, and ſo he loſt that *greater grace*, which he never had. Did you never hear of thoſe, *qui vitam eripuerunt nondum datam*? We may well enough be ſaid to *loſe* a thing before we be *ſeized* of it.

Here you make a ſtand, and breath your ſelf awhile upon *Calvin*, telling us [how ill your Readers patience would bear the multitudes of places] which you [upon a little ſearch could find in this one Author, ſtriking at the very face of the Doctrine of Perſeverance;] yea and that [you verily believe, that there is every whit as much to be found in his Writings againſt this Doctrine, as for it; yet will you infer hence, not ſo much the inſtability of judgment, in ſo worthy a man.] Your weakeſt Reader may do that without your help. [But the ſignal uſefulneſs, or neceſſity of ſuch a poſition in Chriſtianity, without the help whereof, thoſe that are enemies unto it, know not how to manage their Chriſtian occaſions or affairs.]

But ſurely they are not only *weak*, but *wicked*, who profeſs hoſtility to a Doctrine, whereof they have ſuch continual *uſe*, and which deſerves ſo highly of them, for the aſſiſtance it lends them in all [their Chriſtian affairs] which would miſerably miſcarry without it. If this Doctrine be ſo uſefull to them, they are very unthankfull to it, *& ingratos ſi dixeris*, you may add what you will; plainly you call them at once both *fools* and *knaves*, as we ſay by *craft*: no better then *fools* if they *underſtand not* the Doctrine, whether they *uſe* it, or *oppoſe* it, they ſhew their *wit* alike. *Knaves* if *underſtanding it*, and *knowing it* to be *falſe*, they will *preach it* on any *occaſion*, for any *purpoſe*. *Pia fraus*, is no better then *impia*; He is the worſt man who

is

is *facto, pius, & ſceleratus, eodem. Veryer knaves*, if underſtanding it, and *knowing it* to be *true*, they preſume to *diſpute* ſo induſtriouſly *againſt it*. As you carry it, you put them into a fair capacity of a place, either in one or other of thoſe honourable Societies.

Stultorum Bedlam nebulonum Regia Bridewell.

And not ſatisfying your ſelf to dignifie them thus, in this one particular, you ſubjoyn that [you ſhall make the like obſervation upon them] queſtionleſs out of eſpecial obſervance [in reference to all the other main points held forth and argued in this your Treatiſe, in Oppoſition to Vulgar Tenets, preſuming themſelves Orthodox, becauſe Vulgar.] Tenents the more vulgar they are among *Orthodox* men, the more reaſon they have to think themſelves *honourable*, but if the *Patrons* of thoſe *Tenents* be fain to borrow the help of their *Adverſaries Doctrines* to *ſave* their *reputation*, or *do* their *buſineſs*, they are unworthy the name of Orthodox, or honeſt, or knowing. It is much eaſier for you to *accuſe*, then to *prove* them guilty; as much dirt as you throw, you do not ſo much defile their faces, as your own fingers.

After this Welch bait, you go on to add another Teſtimony from *Calvin*, wherein [he doth not only, or ſimply aſſert a poſſibility, both of the total and final falling away of true believers, but of a frequent reduction of ſuch a poſſibility into act. The place is in his Commentaries upon 2 *Pet.* 2. *Vix enim decimus quiſque, eorum qui Chriſto nomen dederunt, fidei puritatem ad extremum uſque retinet. Omnes fere ad corruptelas degenerant, atque à magiſtris licentia deluſi, profaneſcunt.*] But do you think, or do you think that *Calvin* did think, that the *greater part* of thoſe who had given *their names* to Chriſt, have the *ſpirit* of Chriſt? yea or thoſe that *profeſs purity of faith, profeſs faith in purity*? Sir, they receive the *purity of faith* into *impure hearts*; which though their *mouths* were *Chriſtians*, were alwaies *infidels*; a man may have the *pure doctrine of faith*, without *pure faith* according to the *Doctrine*. You ſhut up all at length with this ponderous concluſion, [So that what *Auſtin* ſaid long ſince concerning *Tertullian*, that being acute, or ſharp-witted, he was ſometimes overcome with a ſight of the truth, contrary to his opinion, may truly be ſaid of *Calvin* alſo; a ſight of the truth] forſooth, even [contrary to his ſtanding judgment and opinion, now and then glanced in upon him, and overcame him, ſubjecting his pen and conſcience at once for a ſeaſon unto her ſervice, however the viſion ceaſing, anticipated thoughts, it is like, ſoon recovered their former poſſeſſion.]

I make no queſtion but as much acuteneſs and ſharpwittedneſs as you would ſeem here to acknowledg in *Calvin*, you indeed take it to be *dulneſs* and *obtuſeneſs*, that he ſaw not the inconſiſtency of theſe curſorie paſſages, with his [*ſtanding judgment*;] and as much as you overlook the common Preachers of this Doctrine of Perſeverance, as dull, drie Fellows; I doubt not but you will graciouſly vouchſafe them your Teſtimony for the like [*acuteneſs* and *ſharpwittedneſs*] with *Calvin*, upon this *ſcore of contradicting* moſt ingenuouſly, their *Doctrine* by their *Uſe*. Mr. *Goodwin* in the mean time, ſhews only *his own acuteneſs* in diſcovering *contradiction* in thoſe paſſages, which duller wits conceive ſufficiently *reconciled*.

After this teſtimony of *Calvin*, you proceed to produce ſome others from *Muſculus, Martyr, Aretius, Bullinger, Piſcator, Diodat, Junius*; but not without this acknowledgment in your tranſition, that [they followed *Calvin* in the ſame unhappy undertaking againſt your Doctrine, only they had the happineſs to be overcome by the truth, againſt their wills.] Whether this make more for the glory of your Doctrine, or the diſhonor of theſe Doctors, I know not, but am to examin what they ſay.

Appear *Muſculus*,

Who notwithſtanding the large quotation you produce, is directly againſt the *loſs of juſtification*. Let the Reader but have the patience to conſult him in the very entrance of this his 6. Sect. diſt. Cap. de Remiſſione peccatorum. *Niſi firma ſit in ſempiternum remiſſionis gratia, non poterit ſalus noſtra conſtans eſſe & firma. Neque enim alia nobis reliqua eſt ratio, per quam ſalvimur ſi iſta concidat, & irrita reddatur, neceſſe eſt igitur,*

igitur, ut peccata ſemel remiſſa ſint in ſempiternum, niſi vana eſt omnis illa Doctrina & promiſſio de vita ac ſalute æterna; per Chriſtum humano generi parta; quod ſine impietate cogitare non poterit; eſt hoc quidem certum, & indubitate tenendum. And afterward for ſanctification, *Aliud eſt ſimpliciter peccare quod accidit etiam filiis Dei, aliud prorſus è gratiâ Dei excidere, prolabi, Chriſtum ab integro crucifigere & ludibrio exponere quod* reproborum eſt. *ibid.*

And again, *Poſſit mihi objici hoc in loco, relapſum ejuſmodi, per quem peccata ſemel remiſſa reddantur irrita locum in electis habere non poſſe, immo ne in reprobis quidem, quod illi remiſſionis peccatorum capaces eſſe nequeant, eo quod verâ & vivâ fide, per quam illa acquiritur, præditi non ſint; ideoque neminem eſſe prorſus, in quo peccata ſemel remiſſa irrita fieri poſſint. Verum eos qui hoc argumento ducuntur moneo, ut de* reprobis *quod dicunt, diligentius perpendant, De electis conſentio, de reprobis vero nullane illis unquam peccatorum remiſſio contingat, diſputari poſſe intelligo. Ibid.*

Such a remiſſion he it ſeems allows the Reprobrates, as Mr. *Ball* doth, after a ſort; and ſuch a one few of us deny. For an anſwer to your paſſage of [Remiſſion of ſins recalled,] I remit you to what hath been ſaid formerly of the ſame Argument.

2. For the paſſage you quote of his *Loc. de peccato. Sect.* 5.

He tels you plainly, *Non poteſt fieri, ut qui vera fide prædita ſunt, ad hunc modum enormiter, impiè, ſceleratè, & deploratè peccent.* And when any fall ſo far as to trample under foot the bloud of Chriſt, he denies they are in a capacity of *returning*; and to this it is, that that paſſage of his which you ſo much inſiſt on relates [*Scio hic à nonnullis aliter ſentiri, verum quid mihi videatur, abſque illorum injuria libere dico.*]

3. Well but ſay you [for the clearneſs and throughneſs of his judgment, on that ſide of the Controverſie on which we ſtand, ſeveral other paſſages of his writings ſpeak home. *Animus enim ad hunc modum contriſtatus, facile eo labitur, ut incipiat ſenſim per ſiniſtram ſuſpicionem labefactus deficere à Chriſtianiſmo, & vera fide.*] So I think do many *deficere à Chriſtianiſmo*, who were never Saints; Chriſtians by *name*; but who *while* they *had a name that they lived, were indeed dead*; *& à vera fide*, in regard of the *Doctrine*, who had never the *grace* of faith. This is true of the Galatians, and ſome others who fell by our confeſſion, as well as *Muſculus's*, and from *remiſſion of ſins too in a ſort*, as your old friend Mr. *Ball* doth well enough expreſs it.

2. And this is as much as *Peter Martyr* intended, in the place you alleadg in 1. *ad Cor.* 13.2. witneſs his own words, *Fidem iſtorum poſſe quidem veram appellari, quoad ea quæ fatentur, ſed quoad ipſam fidem, ſed naturam ipſius excutiamus, non eſt germana, & legitima fides.* And he illuſtrates it by two inſtances, one whereof is, that the Turks themſelves may be ſaid to have *veram fidem*, in regard of ſome Articles of the Chriſtian faith, as the Almightineſs of God, *&c.* The Turks are according to him, as good Chriſtians, as ſome of your Saints in this Book.

3. Nor is this more then *B. Aretius* intends by his [*Converſi*,] of which you make ſo much, *Converted* to *profeſſe* the *Chriſtian faith*, not *converted* ſo as to be *regenerate.*

4. *Bullinger*, I grant underſtands *faith* in another ſenſe [*Nobis interim ſit ſatis, quod æterna felicitas nobis eſt in tuto, quam nullus hominum, aut dæmonum, poſſit intercipere, modo ne nos deficiat fides, qua neglectis rebus mortalium, toti pendeamus a Cœlo.* He (ſay you) that ſuppoſeth or affirmeth a man to be out of all danger, or poſſibility of periſhing, but only in caſe of a failing of his faith, neceſſarily ſuppoſeth, 1. That ſuch a man is at preſent inveſted with ſuch a faith, which is of the *ſaving kind*: And 2. That there is a poſſibility that this faith may fail him before his end.] Yea I pray add if you pleaſe, that there is an *impoſſibility* that his faith ſhould *not fail*, unleſs it were continually ſupported by the gracious influence of the *Spirit of God.* We ſay ſo, whatever you doe; and ſo we allow both *Bullingers Text*, and *your Comment* on it.

5. But next, who would have ſuſpected that ever old *John Piſcator* ſhould have been

been *hooked* in by you, to bear witneſs againſt this unfortunate Doctrine of Perſeverance? queſtionleſs he is out of his element, as much as a fiſh out of the water, and will ſoon be as mute, as much as you would enforce him to ſpeak for you. Well but,

Munera magna quidem miſit, ſed miſit in hamo.

He then in his *Scholia* upon *Rom.* 14. 15. makes the Apoſtle ſay, *That a believer for whom Chriſt died, may through an offence taken, forſake the profeſſion of the Goſpel, and ſo periſh out of the faith of Chriſt.* And what is this, being interpreted, but to affirm, that true believers, even ſuch, for whom Chriſt died, may fall away, ſo as to periſh *in piridit, id eſt, offendato, ut Evangelii profeſſionem deſerat, atque ita extra Chriſti fidem pereat, Metinymia effecti, pro quo mortuus eſt, quippe qui mortuus eſt pro omnibus credentibus.*]

But hath not this Learned Author cleared himſelf in his Analyſis for *credentibus*? *i.e.* ſaith he, *ex judicio charitatis* only; and ſo for *pro quibus Chriſtus mortuus eſt, in judicio charitatis*: *Piſcators* teſtimony then is not worth a *gudgeon*; a hundred of them ſcarce make a *penniworth*; *Potuitque minoris*

Piſcator quam piſcis emi.

But if *Piſcator* will not, yet *Deodat* ſhall doe the doe [*Periſt, i.e.* ſaith he, ſhall be *in danger of wounding his conſcience mortally, and he may do ſomewhat to the ſhipwrach of his ſalvation.* 1. He that is *dead*, is in no danger of being *wounded mortally*; but he who being *alive*, is in this danger, is in a poſſibility at leaſt of ſuffering accordingly. 2. Nor can any perſon be ſaid to make *ſhipwrack of that*, of which he never was *poſſeſt*, nor yet to be in *danger* hereof.]

1. I am not ſatisfied, but that he who is *dead*, may be *wounded mortally*. I think that *cutting of the head* is a *mortal blow*; and that a *dead man* may have ſuch execution done on him. I am ſure I have heard of an old woman, that ſeeing her good man break his neck with a fall from a houſe, a hatchet hanging at his girdle, ſolemnly bleſſed God, that *he had no more hurt*. Sir, a wound is ſaid to be mortal, not becauſe it doth *actually bring death*, but becauſe it is ſuch as *cannot be cured*, and I think a *leſs wound* in a *dead man*, is in this reſpect the more *mortal*. But ſeriouſly I would fain know whether a man that hath committed the *ſin againſt the holy Ghoſt*, cannot commit a *mortal ſin after it*? he ſhould not be in a capacity to do it upon your grounds, becauſe he is *dead already*, and *cannot be ſaved*.

2. We deny not but the man who is moſt alive ſpiritually, is in danger of being *wounded thus mortally*, and not only in a *poſſibility* of ſuffering accordingly, but in an *impoſſibility* of *not ſuffering*, if left to *himſelf*. The like we ſay of [*ſuffering ſhipwrack.*] So that *Diodats* teſtimony is not like to go for a *Deodand*, for any harm it will ever do to our Doctrine.

7. Nor doe we more fear it will ſuffer from the Reverend hand of our Learned *Junius*. For what if he ſay [*Si non poſſet fieri, ut juſtus, vel credens aliquis deficeret, neque Hypotheſin hanc facturus eſſet Apoſtolus, neque ex Hypotheſi tam gravi pronunciatura allaturus, neque ad hanc cauſam, quæ agitur, hoc dictum Hebræis, quibus ſcribebat accommodaturus. Jun. in Parallil. ad Heb.* 6. 4, 5, 6.] For we deny not but that [*poteſt fieri ut juſtus vel credus aliquis deficiat*] in regard of himſelf; we ſay he *cannot ſtand*, ſo far are we from ſaying he *cannot fall*. But I pray what doth *Junius* ſubjoyn? [*Sed ipſa indefinitarum propoſitionum, quæ quidem contingentes ſunt, ea natura eſt, ut nunquam dici univerſales poſſint, propriè, & per ſe, propterea intelligendum eſt, in eorum numero qui dona illa perceperunt, eſſe qui excidunt, & eſſe qui non excidunt, nec poſſunt excidere.* Such he eſteems all the Elect. *Junius* is too much our friend to hurt us by his *good will*, and too *wiſe* to do it *againſt his will*. Let him ſpeak on therefore and ſpare not [*A Domino nihil plane defuturum eſt, modo ne nobis deficiamus ipſi.*] Do any of us uſe to make bones of ſuch words as theſe, if *we be not wanting to our duty, God will not be wanting to us in his bounty*? What hath *Junius*

more

more to say against us? [*Christus postulat à nobis unicam conditionem, nempe ut maneamus in ipso, & circumspiciamus, attendamusque nobis, ab omni peccato, & infidelitate; quemadmodum ipse in nobis spondet, se mansurum esse.*] I hope you shall find us all as liberal of such expressions, and as forward to call upon men to look about them, and perform Conditions in order to their salvation; the promise whereof we say is Conditional, as loudly as your self. But saith *Junius* upon the place, *Christus sine conditione, præstat suis, quacunque opus sunt ad sanctificationem ipsorum.* Their remaining in him is indeed a Condition, not only of their salvation, but their comfort; but his remaining in them, is that which gives them grace to remain in him. And so I humbly take leave of this Honoured Author.

8. But *Mollerus* strikes so hard at us, that we all fall before him. [Upon Psal. 51. 12. he Commenteth, *that* David *lost the holy Ghost by his sin,*] That is expounded by what follows, [and was deprived of his gifts] he tels you not in whole, we acknowledg in part without any offence taken by our Doctrine Onward [so that he departing from, or not governing *David*, as formerly, his heart became polluted with wickedness of all sorts] that is a little Hyperbolical, [*Therefore he praies that a clean heart might be again created in him*] that word is Tropical, not proper, [*which the Apostle cals an heart purified by faith*] and so I hope may, and must, the *purest heart on earth*, much more in case of *pollution contracted*, be purified; [*that so he might have right thoughts of God*] Mr. *Goodwin* belike hath so accurate notions of God, that he neither doth, nor needeth use this prayer. [*Might truly acknowledg God without hypocrisie, or simulation*] The sincerer Saints are, the more they are wont, and conceive they have cause to pray in this kind [*but might come to call upon him, believe on him, fear, obey him, &c.*] I hope as long as we live, we shall never be past the use of this *Prayer*. Howbeit Mr. *Goodwin* saith that [these words clearly suppose a total Apostasie, and that this Text needs no Commentary.] We all need this prayer when we *stand upprightest* and *firmest*, and he who thinks he needs it not, shewes he is desperately fallen by so presumptuous a conceit of his standing.

SECT. 23. You gravely tell us [You might add the Testimony, both of former Councels and Synods] out of your old friend *Vossius*, [and of many late Reformed Churches] out of your dear Comrade *Bertius*. But [you chuse to refer your Reader to these Authors respectively] and only [imbulk your Discourse] with a snatch out of [the Confession of the Reformed Churches of *Saxony*.] But I doubt this Saxonian Confession will be but so much sand; and so [this taste] will satisfie the Reader, unless his stomack be so sharp set as to be ready to digest any more gravel your liberality shall be pleased to feed him with.

[When it is said (saith the Confession) that sins remain in the Regenerate, it is necessary that a difference be made: for from that saying *Luke* 11. *He goes and takes to him seven worse spirits*, and the like sayings, it is manifest that some regenerate persons grieve and shake, or dash the holy Spirit out of them, are again cast off by God, and become guilty of the wrath of God, and of eternal punishment.] 1. The [dashing] is but a dash of your own pen, to shew how well it can acquit it self at the exercise of variation. *Scribe cum dasho.* 2. It appears not by the Text, that the men there spoken of are regenerate men; what if it be spoken of men delivered from a corporal possession by the Devil (of which mention is made in the Verses before) and yet not from a spirital possession? yet that makes more against the Confession, then your self. Therefore 3. let it pass, and I yield all, that [some regenerate men grieve the Spirit] so we are all apt to do too often [and shake the holy spirit out of them] *viz.* in part, that is, part of his graces and comforts [and are again become guilty of the wrath of God, and of eternal punishments] so we are by every sin we commit, in regard of its desert [yea and be cast off by God] *viz.* in respect of the shining of his *face upon us* as formerly, and his *writing bitter* things against us in our consciences; you know who complained, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* It follows not from all this, that any regenerate man shall ever be *so cast off by God*, as that he shall suffer that *eternal wrath and punishment* which he deserves. You have hitherto sucked

no

no more out of the Churches of *Saxony*, then any Rock would have plentifully enough afforded you.

And the words after, [They again become liable to the wrath of God, and eternal punishment] are liable to the same exception with the former. I wis none of us deny our *liableness* to the [*wrath of God, and eternal punishment*] when we are at our *best*. *If thou Lord shalt be extream to mark what is done amiss, O Lord who shall stand?* Psal. 130. *But there is mercy with thee, therefore shalt thou be feared*, even when we are assured we shall be freed by thy mercy in Christs merits, from that, whereto of our selves we are alwaies too justly liable. And so I take my leave of *Saxony*, and prepare my self to wait upon you to *Dort*, as soon as you have made up your baggage in five considerable Conclusions.

In the mean time I cannot but stand a little amazed, that you had not found somwhat in the Articles of the Church of *England*, against our Doctrine of Perseverance, and made that good which you cast out in the first Chapter of this your Digression, that, [Her first Reformers had two Nations strugling in their wombs about this point.] The truth is, the Article seems not so clear, but that Dr. *Reynolds*, and those Divines that were imployed together with him at the Conference of *Hampton* Court, would have had it explained; but not for any just exception against the words, but for prevention of a wilfull misconstruction of them, which they foresaw would be made in after-times; and accordingly they humbly desired, that the Articles of *Lambeth* (wherein these points were more deaerd) might be added to the established Confession of faith. I conceive Dr. *Reynolds* understood the judgment of the first Reformers, all as well as Mr. *Goodwin*, and a little better then *F. G.* the late gracious Patron of *fur Prædestinatus*. Nor was *A. Whitgift* to seek of it, nor would he have abetted Dr. *Whitaker* (as he did, at least at first) had Dr. *Whitaker* gainsaid the Received Doctrine: Nay the Censure of *Barret* by the University of *Cambridg* (as much as it hath beene censured by I know not whom, unless that Reverend and Godly *F.G.*) makes it manifest, what thoughts that University had of the constant judgment of the Church. And the Translators [resting the Scriptures to this Doctrine] (as M. *Goodwin* chargeth them more then once) is a farther argument, that they (who had I hope as good eyes as M. *Goodwin*) looked on this as a Doctrine wherof their *Mother* was very tender. Nay, and B. *Andrews* (who we may safely say was almost as knowing a man as M. *Goodwin*, and as zealous for the Church of *England*, as Mr. *Goodwin* can be against it) saith expressly in his judgment upon the nine Articles drawn up by Dr. *Whitaker*, *Certe nemo unquam dixerit* (*credo*) *fidem in Electis finaliter excidere*. Had any of the first Reformers said it, a thousand to one but B. *Andrews* had had some intelligence of it, or if no Chaplain had whispered it in his ear, yet *Bancroft* would have spoken it out to King *James*. But even he it seems was so far from having any incling of it, that when your good friend *Bertius* his Book *De Apostasia Sanctorum*, was first presented him, he was so taken with the wit of the man, that, as I have been told by no worse man then the Arch-Bishop of *Armah*, he said, the better to express the absurdity of it, he should write another Book *De Castitate meretriciam*. It was not out of any conceit of novelty in Dr. *Whitakers* Articles, that King *James* had no mind to gratifie Dr. *Reynolds* and his brethren, by adding them to the 39 Articles; but questionless he denyed their suit upon some reasons of State, which I list not to enquire into, but am confident he built not upon those odd Principles of the Lord *Burley*, mentioned by *F. G.* which shew him to be as shallow a Divine, as he was a profound Polititian. We use to say, the greatest Clerks are seldom the wisest men; and without offence, the wisest men are not alwaies as much as ordinary Clerks. But of these particulars I shall shortly have a fitter occasion to speak more fully in another Idiom.

In the mean time, I remember Dr. *Twiss* saith, King *James* was wont to Dignifie your *Arminius* with the Title of *that enemy of the grace of God*; and I have heard an old Prebend of *Winchester* (who was the first Divine that appeared in Parlament against the superstitious Innovations in the Church, about the year 1628. say, he waited on King *James*, when *Vorstius* his Book *de Deo* was first presented him, and that

the King was ſo exaſperated, that he ſaid to him, giving a fair teſtimony of *Vorſtius* his Book againſt *Bellarmin*, that notwithſtanding the good ſervice he had done in *that work*, he would, had he had him upon the place, *thruſt his head into the fire*; but however, how he lift his hand againſt *Vorſtius*, the world hath ſufficiently known. Had ſundry of the firſt Reformers of this Church of *England*, been for your Doctrine, which holdeth ſo fair a correſpondence with that of *Vorſtius*, King *James* out of reſpect to them, would have been leſs rigid againſt him, then both his writings and endeavours for the convening of the Synod of *Dort* ſpeaks him, and that lowdly enough in the ears of all the Chriſtian world.

You at laſt ſum up the principal reſults of theſe pregnant teſtimonies, and tell us [Five things are concludable from them above all contradiction,

1. That the Doctrine of abſolute and unconditioned Perſeverance, as it is commonly taught and believed among Profeſſors at this day, and as it is ſtated and maintained in the writings of many Reformed Divines, over-honoured, many of them, with the ſtile of Orthodox] *viz.* Mr. *Goodwin* being the ſoveraign Judge and Moderator in all Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical [was not known or heard of by the name of Orthodox, in the Primitive and purer times of Chriſtian Religion, nor owned or taught by any of the Learned Fathers, or Writers, for ſeveral centuries of years after Chriſt.]

Your *Concluſion* is too nimble for your *Premiſſes*; what if *you* have reckoned up *ſome* paſſages of the *Ancients*, and *Voſſius*, from whom you borrowed them, *more*? I hope neither you nor he, have quoted *all the Ancients*, nor *all* that is found in the books of *thoſe you have quoted*; and how then come you to conclude ſo *univerſally*, that [this Doctrine of Perſeverance was not owned or taught, by *any* of the Learned Fathers, for ſeveral centuries of years after Chriſt?] I beſeech you conſider whether *ſome*, yea *moſt* of the Fathers of thoſe years, *not teaching* it, will prove that *none* of *them* taught it; or whether *theſe paſſages* which you alleadg, prove that *theſe very Fathers* did *not teach it*. You may as well tell us, *Calvin* and *Martyr*, *Piſcator* and *Junius* did not teach it, becauſe you have found *ſome words* of *theirs*, which ſeem to ſound againſt it, no leſs then thoſe of *the Fathers*; nay you may ſay *none of our Divines at this day teach it*, becauſe I dare ſay, *none of them* forbear to uſe *ſuch words* as theſe you have quoted, at one time or other: So that it is clear, *your Concluſion* outleaps *your Premiſſes*; and by this *outleaping* (oh myſterious ill-luck) falls ſhort of your purpoſe.

Your 2. Concluſion [That neither ſince the Reformation of Religion by *Luther* and his Compiers, hath it found entertainment with the generality, at leaſt of that numerous party of Proteſtants, which for diſtinctions ſake, are termed Lutherans] is fairly yielded by us, yet not proved by you neither; for what if *Melanthon* and *Chemnitius* be not for this Doctrine, is therefore the *Generality* of the Lutheran name againſt it? Dr. *Prideaux* his Credit is that which muſt help out this concluſion, it cannot ſtand without leaning upon his *Chair*, which yet you tell us in another place [weighs] not ſo much but that it may be overturned at any time by one or two arguments, ſuch as *you* are wont to *produce*.

But ſurely upon the place, you overthrow much of the honour of his Chair, by a miſrepreſentation of his report concerning the Lutherans. I deſire the Reader to have recourſe to what hath been ſaid before of both the *Lutherans judgment* in this point, and Dr. *Prideaux's judgment* of the Lutherans.

Your 3. Concluſion is [that this Doctrine of yours is by ſome of the moſt Learned and judicious followers of *Calvin* pregnantly, and with particularity of profeſſion avouchfed] 1. This *Concluſion*, is I think juſt the ſame with your *Premiſſes*; and ſo it might have contented it ſelf with the Title of a Repetition, and not have affected that of a Concluſion. *Muſculus*, *Martyr*, *Aretius*, *Bullinger*, *Piſcator*, *Deodat*, *Junius*, *Mollerus*, ſay ſomewhat for the Doctrine of Apoſtaſie, *ergo* they ſay ſomewhat for the Doctrine of Apoſtaſie; or [they have pregnantly, and with particularity of profeſſion, avouched it,] *ergo* they have ſo avouched it.

Your

Your 4. Concluſion is, that [*Calvin* himſelf is conſtrained, ever and anon to give teſtimony to it.] This is much like your former Concluſion; and to both I ſhall return this, 1. That the *words which you quote*, have been found to ſignifie *no ſuch thing*. 2. The *like words* may be heard every day from *thoſe who mean no ſuch matter*. 3. You may as well ſay, *we are all of your judgment*, for *none of us* ſtick to uſe *ſuch words as theſe*, nor do they fall from us *inconſiderately* and *imprudently*, but upon ſerious deliberation, we find that they are of *uſe to our people*, no *prejudice* to *our Doctrine*. We ſay our Doctrine may *maintain all theſe expreſſions*, and never *undoe her ſelf*. It appears you do not know the *ſtate of it*, ſo well as you would ſeem to do.

Your 5 Concluſion is, that [your Doctrine hath been held by Councels, Synods, and whole Proteſtant Churches alſo, in their Confeſſions] though you name but one, and that comes not up to your point neither.

For theſe five Concluſions, by a kind of *ſuperfœtation*, there grows a *Sixth*, which though it be not ſtiled a *Concluſion*, yet is the *main* thing aimed at all along this worthy diſcourſe. [All which conſidered, we ſhall need no other demonſtration of the importune unreaſonableneſs and vanity of thoſe *ecſtatical* and wild Encomiums, or exorbitant depredications of the Doctrine of inevitable and unfruſtrable Perſeverance, which are found in the Writings, and heard from the mouthes of ſome of the over-zealous Admirers of it; as if for example, it were the fundamental Article of the Reformed Religion; one of the principal Points of Chriſtian Religion, wherein the Proteſtant Churches are purged from Popiſh errors, and which hath alwaies been maintained by the Reformed Churches, againſt Papiſts, the foundation of all true certainty of ſalvation, without which that fiducial and firm aſſurance, which is requiſite in, and unto true believing, cannot ſtand; ſuch a Doctrine, which all true Miniſters of the Goſpel ought to inculcate into, and whet upon all true believers for their comfort, with many like ſwelling words of vanity. Doubtleſs if it be an error, and confederate againſt the holineſs and truth of the Goſpel (a crime which hath been by many competent and ſufficient witneſſes, proved againſt it) it is ſo far from meriting any of thoſe impotent acclamations lately ſpecified, that it really deſerves to have its portion with thoſe Merchants, and Money-changers, whom our Saviour, with a ſcourge, drove out of the Temple, as profaners of the Holy Deſigne and Counſel of God therein.]

Nay if it be guilty of ſuch *Treaſon* againſt the *Goſpel of God*, let it not only be *whipped*, but *hanged*, *drawn*, and *quartered*. Tuſh, what is it to have it [ſcourged with the money-changers out of the Temple] let it with the *Coyners of counterfeit money*, be ſent to *Tiburn*, there to receive whatever reward the wiſdom of Juſtice ſhal think fit to allot it: If this Doctrine be *guilty*, you are too *mild*; but if *not guilty* (as we truſt it will appear to any impartial Jury) you are as much too *cruel*. Well we hope thoſe [ſwelling words of vanity] are not altogether emptie of *truth*, and that this Doctrine may challeng little leſs then what they aſcribe to her.

But 1. Whoſe are theſe words? It is an argument of a ſpirit ſufficiently puffed up, to charge thoſe Reverend and Learned men which hold and Preach this Doctrine with [ſwelling words of vanity.]

2. When you have pricked theſe words with the beſt of your acumen, you will let out very little *vapour*, nor will they loſe of their *weight*, which we humbly conceive is more then their *ſwelling*. For albeit we call not this Point [*the Fundamental Article of the Reformed Religion*] yet may we ſafely affirm, that it is neerly *allied* to the Fundamental point. We look upon *Juſtification by faith*, as the *Fundamental Point*, in oppoſition to thoſe high thoughts which the Church of *Rome* hath of Works: concerning this faith, the *Reformed Churches* teach in oppoſition to that of *Rome*, *That Chriſtians not only may, but ought to aſſure themſelves of ſalvation*. Now how they ſhould *aſſure themſelves of ſalvation*, if their ſalvation be not *ſurely decreed to them*; and how *their ſalvation ſhould be ſurely decreed to them*, if their *perſeverance in faith be not ſo decreed*; and how they ſhould *know that their perſeverance is decreed*, ſave only by this, that *Gods decrees are known by his actings*, and promiſes of *future* actings in relation to *former*, who can imagine that he having *acted ſo far* upon our hearts,

as to renew us by a *lively faith*, and promiſed that where he hath *begun this work*, he will *perfect it unto the day of Jeſus Chriſt*, *here is a promiſe* of our *preſervation*, which *promiſe* ſuppoſeth a *decree* of our *preſervation*, and that *decree*, though *unknown* in it *ſelf*, yet may be known by the *effects of it*, and Gods *beginning* this good work, is an infallible argument that he hath *decreed to perfect it*. Thus this Doctrine of Perſeverance lieth very *near* the [Fundamental Article of the Reformed Religion] & may well be ſtiled *one of the principal points wherein the Proteſtant Churches are purged from Popery*. It is ſo neceſſary to that point of *aſſurance of ſalvation*, which the *Reformed Divines generally teach*, not only as *poſſible* to be attained, but *neceſſary* to be *ſtrived* for by *all believers*; that but for *this Doctrine of Perſeverance*, it were *impoſſible* to be attained, and conſequently it would argue as much *vanity* as is poſſible, to *attempt* it. You that can ſhew how men may be *competently aſſured of ſalvation* without being beholding to a *Decree of heaven*, and how they may find your Doctrine of Apoſtaſie *more comfortable then that of perſeverance*, may do much more then *other men* can *dream* of. We have no hopes to defend *aſſurance of ſalvation* againſt the Papiſts, without the neceſſary help of our *Doctrine of Perſeverance*. And let me tell you, the Lutherans themſelves, upon this occaſion, ſpeak as liberally of it as we.

Be pleaſed but to review the place which you mentioned in *Chemnitius Examen. de fide Juſtif. pag.* 172. *Quarto objiciunt* (*viz. Pontificii contra certitudinem fidei*) *etiam ſententiâ de perſeverantia; ut maxime de præſenti gratia certi ſint credentes, neminem tamen certum eſſe an ſit perſeveraturus in finem; & quia illi ſoli ſalvi ſunt, qui uſque in finem perſeverant, non igitur poſſe certam fiduciam eſſe de ſalute credentium.* He anſwers, *Petant perſeverantiam —— & hoc modo non debent* dubitare *de perſeverantiâ, ſed ſtatuere juxtâ promiſſiones.* Phil. 1. &c.

Hæ ſententiæ manifeſtè oſtendunt, ſpem fidelium de Perſeverantiâ non eſſe inter cœlum, & terram, in ambiguâ dubitatione *ſuſpenſam.* Ibid.

Doctrina Monachorum, quæ jubet dubitare de Remiſſione peccatorum, & quidem in converſione, jubet remanere in dubitatione, falſa, impia, & Ethnica eſt, & reipſa delet Evangelium, ſaith your friend *Melanchon, Diſp. de Pœnit. Hab.* 4. *Oct.* 1548. in the ſecond *Tome* of *Luthers* Works. Theſe words ſeem to me to ſound no leſs then thoſe you have quoted.

SECT. 24. You are pleaſed for a cloſe of this Chapter, and your whole Digreſſion, to fall on [the Shield and Buckler of the Synod of *Dort.*] The firſt arrow which you ſhoot againſt it, though it want a *head*, yet wants not *poyſon*, and that ſuch, as there is but one man alive, at leaſt of this Nation, that could poſſibly have furniſhed us with an Antidote againſt it. It is ſo ſhameleſs a Calumny, that you would ſeem to abhor to give credit to it; and to what purpoſe then I pray did you mention it?

[Far be it from me (ſay you) to ſubſcribe the report or information of thoſe, who charge the reſpective Members of this Synod, with ſuffering themſelves to be bound with an Oath, at or before their admiſſion hereunto, to vote down the Remonſtrants and their Doctrines howſoever.] Whence I pray had you this Report? Why had you not named ſome one or other of the *Reporters*? you name none; and therefore may well be taken for the *Forger* of this Slander: Surely none of the Divines themſelves have told you it; and it is as incredible they told others: Whence then come they to the knowledg of this ſecret? they muſt have it either from them *who took*, or them who *adminiſtred* this ſtrange Oath, or thoſe who were on the place; Tell us from which, and whether they *repented* of taking or adminiſtring this *Oath*, or not: It was not more eaſie to *caſt out* ſuch an accuſation, then it is impoſſible to *prove it*. Yea ſay you [Far be it from me to ſubſcribe the Report.] Why but becauſe you have no colour of proof that there was ſuch a report, you forſooth immediately inſinuate, that you believe that there was ſuch an Oath taken: [You ſeem to ſee the intereſt and obligation of an Oath, working in the Synod, much after the ſame manner, as it did in *Herod*, when for his Oaths ſake, contrary to his mind and deſire otherwiſe, he cauſed *John* the Baptiſts head to be given to *Herodias* in a Platter.]

Thus

Thus with the ſame breath, you profeſs *not to credit the report*, and yet to *ſee cauſe why to believe it*: ſo skilfull are you in the art of Calumniating, *aliquid hærebit*. This dirt ſure would have ſtuck ſo faſt on the face of the Synod, in the eyes at leaſt of your credulous Proſelytes, that had it not been that God in his providence had left them one witneſs, beyond all exception, there had been no means to have wiped it off: But may you and your conſcientious Confederates have patience to peruſe the *Copy of a Letter*, which I ſhall here produce, from a hand of that General and unqueſtionable Authority, that the Chriſtian world this day, yields not a greater. Though I ſhould ſuppreſs the name of the Author, all *Brittain* might know it by the *ſtile*.

Salutem in Chriſto.

VVorthy Mr. Kendall,

I Know not how to call it any better then a foul ſlander, which the Author of Redemption Redeemed hath been pleaſed to report, and would inſinuate to believe, as caſt upon the Divines of the Synod of Dort, *(of which number, my unworthy ſelf, am now left only ſurviving) that they were foreingaged ſecretly by ſome foreſtalling Oath, to Vote againſt the Remonſtrant Party, howſoever.* Cum bonis bene agier oportet. *Such ſinfull baſeneſs would have been heartily ſcorned by thoſe grave and Godly perſons. I call the God of heaven to record, that there was never any Oath tendred to us, but that Solemn and Publick one, which is Recorded in the Hiſtory of the Synod; wherein every one of the Divines preſent, both native and forraign, did in all holy reverence, call God to witneſs, that he would proceed in the buſineſs, there and then agitated, uprightly and ſincerely; and that he would judge and determine of thoſe Points controverted, only out of, and according to the written word of God. If thoſe Lyncean eyes can eſpie any error in this Oath, I muſt confeſs we have offended; elſe we are juſtly acquitted before God and men. Nay, to ſay more, we were never ſo much as in the leaſt meaſure, moved or ſollicited to incline either way; but were clearly left to our full freedom in this whole buſineſs, without the leaſt whiſper of any preoccupation; ſo as the imputation is no other then wickedly calumnious. My unhappy ſickneſs called me off, before the full concluſion of that Work; but I ſtaid ſo long as any publick Seſſion, or appearance of the Remonſtrants continued. Thus much in effect, I have formerly, upon the motion of my worthy ſucceſſor at* Waltham, *Mr.* Fuller, *ſignified to him, though not yet extant, as one who cannot but think it was one end of this unexpected protraction of my daies, after all the reſt of my fellows, that I might do this right to that Godly, Learned, Reverend Aſſembly; with the intimation whereof, I bid you farewell in the Lord; and do heartily commend your Studies to the Divine Benediction, profeſſing my ſelf,*

Your loving, and much devoted Friend,
Joſ. Hall, B. *N.*

Higham,
July 25.
1653.

This

This *Letter* from *Higham*, weighes more then a *Volume* from *Colemanſtreet*; and ſhews what Letters he deſerves, that bluſheth not to babble any more of this Oath. So then the integrity of the Synod is cleared.

But next their *inſufficiency* in their managing of the buſineſs, (lack a day) you have ſo evidently demonſtrated [That to ſhew how far they fell below themſelves] and eſpecially below the more Renowned Theologue of *Colemanſtreet* [were but to redoe that which is done already;] but if you doe no more hereafter then you have done already, you will doe little, either to their diſparagement, or your own honour; and as much as you crack [they fall below themſelves,] and before you, you have not ſtood over-well before an incomparably weaker man; but though you goe for a Giant *Gog-magog* upon the Cliffs of *Dover*, yet I may ſafely ſay, I have given you a Corniſh hugg; let others judge how near you have tumbled over and over.

But laſtly, [With as much brevity as the Reader can well deſire, and in a regular proſecution of the deſigne of the Chapter in hand, you will ſhew how near they came in ſenſe, and ſubſtance of matter, to their adverſaries in the preſent queſtion; and leave it to Chriſtian conſideration, whether the difference between the two Combating Parties was of that latitude, or weight, that the one ſhould deſerve the beautifull Crown of Orthodoxiſm and honour, for their diſſent from their adverſaries, and the other the puniſhment, ſhame, and reproach, of perſons ſo deeply and deſperately erroneous, for their non-agreement with theirs.]

Queſtionleſs if the men agreed ſo well, as you ſaid learnedly but now, in the Points controverted, there was no reaſon, why they ſhould be ſo differently eſteemed; but the Point will appear not to be ſo ſmall, but that they ſtood at a ſufficient diſtance in it.

SECT. 25. For 1. What if the [Synod expreſly grant, that they who are under a poſſibility of falling, yea who will *de facto* fall away, (for their *non electis* ſignifie ſuch men as theſe) may be ſupernaturally enlightned, by vertue whereof, they may underſtand that thoſe things which are reported, or laid down in the word of God, are true, and do give an unfeigned aſſent unto them, *Act. Syn. Dord. par. 2. pag* 188.] Does it follow, they grant as much as the Remonſtrants contended for? The *Remonſtrants* hold that the *Elect* may fall away, *any* of them, *all* of them; all that the *Synod* ſaith, is, that [ſome men who are *not elect*, may have ſuch *a ſupernatural illumination, as to underſtand* that *thoſe things which are laid down in the word of God are true, and accordingly aſſent unto them, and that this illumination notwithſtanding, they may fall away.*]

2. What if [the Synod add, that ſuch as theſe be enlightned with the ſupernatural knowledg of the truth of the Goſpel, which enlightning proceeding from the Holy Ghoſt, begets true knowledg in their minds, from whence, as oft as is needfull, they may act or work conformably to it?] The Remonſtranrs hold, that the *elect* may fall away, *any* of them, *all* of them. All that the Synod ſaith, is, that *ſome* men who are *not elect*, may attain to ſuch a meaſure of knowledg, by an enlightning proceeding from the Holy Ghoſt, and that this illumination and knowledg notwithſtanding, they fall away. The Remonſtrants hold, that *election* priviledgeth not men from *falling away*: The Synod holds, that men not priviledged from falling away, by vertue of election, may yet partake of a high meaſure of illumination; The Remonſtrants ſpeak undervaluingly of the *Elect*; the Synod ſpeaks at the higheſt of the *non elect*. Is this trow you, to agree, when they ſpeak not *ad idem*?

3. And what if [the Synod ſay further, *That the ſeed which fell upon ſtony ground, ſignifies ſuch hearers, who for a time believe, i. e.* who aſſent *unto the things revealed by God in the Goſpel; and that their aſſent in this kind was no waies counterfeit or feigned, appears from hence, that they received the word with joy*?] The Remonſtrants hold, that *any*, yea *all* the *elect may fall away* from their faith. The Synod ſaith but this, *that ſome believers who are not elect*, may *fall away*; the Remonſtrants invalidate the

the vertue of *Election* to preſerve *elect believers* from falling away. The Synod ſhews how far they may proceed in belief, who do *not partake in election*. This is the full agreement forſooth; which Mr. *Goodwin* ſo much cracks of between the Synod and the Remonſtrants. If the Members of his Church agree no better together, their *agreement* is rather the *diſtance of brethren* [illegible], a Conſort as harmonious as that of Harp and Harrow, or an Antheme upon Axes and Hammers.

Well, [but by the expreſs tenor of all this diſcourſe, moſt evident it is, that this Synod granteth a poſſibility of falling away, both totally and finally, in thoſe, at leaſt many of them, who by means of a ſupernatural illumination, and this wrought by the holy Ghoſt, come truly and unfeignedly to believe the Goſpel] *viz.* ſome points of it, [yea and to live and walk conformably unto it] *viz.* thoſe points which they believe, but of a full conformity, not a word; [ſo then, if it be made to appear, by the clear evidence of Scripture, that ſuch as theſe, *viz.* who truly and unfeignedly believe the Goſpel, live conformably unto it, &c.] *viz.* ſome points of it, [are true; and ſound believers, in an eſtate of juſtification, acceptation with God, &c.] *Quod erat probandum*, [it undeniably follows, that this Synod held the ſame with the Remonſtrants, whom yet they ground to powder with the weight of their ſentence, as moſt dangerouſly and deſperately erroneous. And the truth is, beſides this of perſeverance, an intelligent Reader may eaſily find] by the help of Mr. *Goodwins* ſpectacles [that in other points alſo, as in the queſtion about *the extent of Chriſts death*, the *extent of ſaving grace*, &c. they deliver and maintain the ſame things, with the perſons ſentenced by them.] *Quere* whether the ſame things for which they ſentenced thoſe perſons? elſe you and I agree well enough in ſome things, though we differ as much in others, relating to, but diverſe from them wherein we unanimouſly agree. [And if not formally, in plainneſs and expreſſneſs of terms, though ſometimes they want very little even of this;] What ſilly fools were they in the mean time, and how Synodically did they determine, if Dr. [redacted] be infallible? [yet arguitively, in grounds and principles manifeſtly bearing, and iſſuing forth the ſame Concluſions.] You ſhould have added, *uncurding ſoftware and your Churches Logick*. How ſoon is this ſorry Synod blown up by an impotent vapour? Alas what ſhould you trouble your ſelf, with an unneceſſary anſwer to their contemptible Arguments, which you ſufficiently *confuted* by *preſenting* them in the end of this Book? you will queſtionleſs but ſpoil too much good paper, in publiſhing another Volume againſt them. You had beſt ſave your ſelf the pains of writing, and the world of reading any more of it,

——facet Ilium, & ingens
Gloria Dardanidum, parte jacet inclytus Hector.

Your victorious breath, which makes a more formidable noiſe then that of *Joſhuah's new faſhion'd Trumpets*, hath laid this *Jericho ſo low*, that no man may preſume to hope, to ſee *one ſtone* of it ever ſtand again upon *another*. But however let all the ſtones be thrown at your *forehead*, it is ſo ſtigmally impenetrable, that it diſdains to admit the leaſt ſhadow of impreſſion. Loe here a *Goliah* for the nonce, who inſtead of a *Weavers Beam*, contents himſelf with a *ſhuttle*, and looks the moſt glorious Hoaſt of the God of heaven down to the ground. All the Kettles in *Colemanſtreet* will not ſuffice for *Drums* at this triumph, nor any other *Chair*, but a new *Sella curulis*, after the cut of Porphyry, one for him to be carried in in a meet ſolemnity, upon the ſhoulders of his learned admirers and adorers. What undeſerved honor did he vouchſafe to put upon *Cambridge*, when he condeſcended ſo low as to Challeng her *Heads*, having given all the *Members* of the Synod of *Dort*, to the *fowles of the air*, and the *beaſts of the field*? and yet this huge Conqueſt ſtood him no more then a big *look*, *vidit*, *vicit*.

But what was this ſame thing which we call the *Synod of Dort*? tuſh, not half ſo venerable an Aſſembly, as that which uſed to be ſummoned at *Smoun Alley*: What was *Carletons* Rochet, to ſome of your more Reverend Green Aprons? or what

were

were *Davenants*, *Halls*, *Wards*, *Goads*, *Scarlet Hoods*, to ſome learneder *Stammin Petticoats*?

And for the Dutch Divines, alas they were a *dull pack*; *Batavorum ingenia*. What were they, *Min heers*, yea *Hogen Mogens*, to the *Cockneyſhire wits*? to blow off all theſe, a little back-breath is enough, it was below ſuch a Champion as you, to take notice of them ſo far as to *face* them. Any ſingle *Pigmy* is an over-match for this poor handfull of *Cranes*; the cocking of ſuch a Beaver as yours, is enough to fright down all their *Bucklers and Shields*, your ſhort *ipſe Dixit*, confounds them all in an *eternal ſilence*. Judge Reader, how much reverence his face may command, which daſheth ſuch a Synod out of *countenance*.

Dixit, & oſtendit ſignum fatale Minervæ.

Well but [though it could not be proved from the Scriptures, that the perſons ſubjected to a poſſibility of a total and final Apoſtaſie, by the Synod, are true and real believers; yet if they were, or be ſuch, in the ſenſe and judgment of the Remonſtrants (which is apparent enough that they were and are) the Synod had no cauſe to fall foul upon them] as you had queſtioneſs to do on the Synod [as erroneouſly diſſenting from them in the point of Perſeverance, but only as diſſenters or erroneous, in judging or diſcerning the difference, between ſound and unſound believers, or between perſons juſtified and not juſtified.] And why ſo? The queſtion is, *Whether true believers be not preſerved by that God that elected them from all eternity, to ſalvation*? The Remonſtrants affirm *they are not*, undervaluing the power of God, denying the *purpoſe* of God to do it; and to prove this, they produce inſtances of *believers who have fallen away*; the Synod ſaith, *Theſe believers were not elected, not true believers* with *ſuch a faith* as is *that of Gods elect*, *that* elſe they had not *fallen away*. This is but a *ſubqueſtion, whether theſe believers had true juſtifying faith*: the *main controverſie is about the falling away of ſuch as have true juſtifying faith*; and if to prove *that*, the Remonſtrants ſubſume *this*, ſhall the Synod be ſaid not to deal fairly, becauſe they forſake not their *main hold*, and lay out all their ſtrength upon this *outwork*? Sir, the foundation which the Synod laies for the perſeverance of the Saints, is not ſo much in the *firmneſs of the Saints faith*, as the *effectualneſs of Gods decree*, the *faithfulneſs of his promiſe*, the *juſt performance of it in his continual ſupplies of grace*, ſo as to *keep his Saints from falling*, or to *raiſe them being fallen*. The Remonſtrants forſooth muſt have leave to ſpeak their pleaſure againſt *all theſe*, and the whole diſpute muſt be reduced to *this one* punctilio, *Whether thoſe Apoſtates had true faith*? No, the Synod had juſt cauſe to oppoſe them in *all*; nor was this [to fall fowl upon them] to ſtand for *theſe precious truths of God*, and *priviledges of the Saints*. The Remonſtrants uſed *this* as *their ſword*, ergo the Synod dealt foully in not caſting away *their own ſwords and bucklers*, and only trying it out bravely, whether they could wreſt the *ſword* out of the *hand of their adverſarie*. This is for none but ſuch doubty Champions as your ſelf: I doubt whether you would be content to be reſtrained to ſuch terms. For inſtance, there was lately a queſtion (as you may pleaſe to remember) between you and your brethren, *Whether the Civil Magiſtrate among us be bound to interpoſe for the defence of the purity of Religion*? Mr. *Goodwin* (whoſe tender care of the Magiſtrate, leſt he ſhould be unſeaſonably overloaden, with this heavie, but unprofitable burthen, put him upon the great pains of drawing up certain little Quæries to this purpoſe) among others, he hath *one* more conſiderable then the *reſt*, *Whether the Chriſtian Magiſtrate be more bound in conſcience to maintain the Chriſtian Religion, then the Mahometan Magiſtrate is to maintain the Mahometan Religion*? And ſurely if he be *not more bound*, he is *bound* ſo *ſlightly*, that he may *loſe* himſelf of his *bonds*, and caſt the cords from him, whenever Mr. *Goodwin* [illegible] in his Godly wiſdom, adviſe him to it, all the Votes and Acts of the late Parliament to the contrary notwithſtanding, as being all repealed, or expired of courſe, upon the ſudden appearance of thoſe unanſwerable quæries of this new tender Father of the Church, and old ſtout Son of the State.

Now

Now if I (for want of other work) were to deal with Mr. *Goodwin* upon *that queſtion of the duty of the Magiſtrate among us in matters of Religion*, ſhould, balking all his other quæries, preſs him to ſtick meerly to this, and to prove againſt me, that *the Chriſtian Magiſtrate is no more bound to maintain Chriſtian Religion, then the Mahometan is to maintain Mahometan Religion* would he ſay that I dealt *fairly* with *my own* Cauſe, or that I fell the leſs *foully* upon *his?* Sure I had dealt with him much as the Lady *Abbeſſe* did with the Devil, when ſhe confined him, poor fiend, to her cloſe-ſtool, where this piece of the paper of *Q*uæries would have been a uſefull commodity for him. Why Sir, is it *foul play* not to leave the *principal thing in queſtion*, and deal wholly upon that which *occaſionally interpoſeth* it ſelf, though with never ſo much *importunity*? Say in this preſent *Digreſſion* of yours, I ſhould have waved *all the reſt* of your Diſcourſe, and have engaged only upon *that choice notion* of yours, that *the Doctrine of the Apoſtaſie of the Saints is much ſweeter and comfortabler then that of their Perſeverance*, had I dealt ever the *fairer* with either *your* Cauſe or *mine own*? But this of the unhandſom carriage of the impertinent Synod, *you* ſaid only *by the way*, and I have gone out *of the way* too farre to follow it.

[That the perſons liabled by the Synod, to a defection from faith, both *total* and *final*, as *viz.* ſuch who being ſupernaturally enlightned] viz. *in ſome particulars*, [have the true knowledg of God] viz. *ut prius*, [unfeignedly believe the Goſpel] *ut ſupra* ſtill, [act conformably] to their faith, *i. e.* unſoundly, [have their affections in part changed] in *one* part *changed*, and in *moſt* part *unchanged*, [their lives in part reformed] and in *more* part *unreformed*, [their perſons in part renewed, *&c.* after the rate above, [are by the Scriptures adjudged for true and ſound believers, for perſons truly juſtified, *&c.* is ſo apparent, that to me there ſeems no place leſt for doubting, unleſs haply prejudice, or anticipation of judgment makes room for any man in this kind] SECT. 26.

God keep me from the *heaven* of *ſuch true* and ſound *believers*; and if I ſhould wiſh *you* may come *there* among them, I ſhould betray more uncharitableneſs, then in judging that all theſe believers, ſo *ſound* that they are all *rotten at the core*, ſo *true*, that they are *falſe* on the *inſide*, have their deſerved portion on the *other ſide of the gulf*. Nor am I led to this apprehenſion, by [any preoccupation or prejudice] but the *Scripture* hath warranted me to conceive, that *ſuch believers* as *theſe*, forſooth, who give the Devil ſo *many inches* in them, will find he will take *whole ells*, *poſſeſs himſelf* of ſo *much of them*, that the Spirit of God will not endure to *dwell ſo near him*. See I pray, what Character the *ſilly Synod* is pleaſed to give of them,

Adhuc enim vitioſarum quibus indulgent cupiditatum fibras, radiceſque, funditus defixas retinent, amore terrenorum penitius afficiantur, & duritiem in imis cordium receſſibus latens non auferatur, &c. and afterwards, *Produnt ſe φιλαύτους, ac potius φιλησδονους, magis quam φιλοθέους, nihilque minus quam Deo frui, quicquid ſibi falſo perſuadeant, ſed revera uti voluiſſe Deo, ut fruantur mundo, ut alicubi Auguſtinus.* Again, *Nunquam ſeriam pœnitentiam agunt, nunquam ſerio dolere afficiuntur, hoc ipſo, quod peccando Deum offenderint, humilem cordis contritionem non attingunt; nec ſincerum propoſitum de non peccando imposterum concipiunt; iis non datur reſipiſcentia ad vitam, &c. non dolor ille ſecundum Deum, cujus nunquam pœniteat; non ſunt pauperes ſpiritu, &c.* And what wonder if *ſuch believers* have no part in *that kingdom of heaven* for which their over-zealous advocate, hath I hope, reſolved to prepare himſelf.

Onwards ſtill the Synod proceeds to repreſent them as ſuch as have never any ſerious deſire of reconciliation to God, and ſpeaks as if it had been in the boſoms of them, *nunquam ſerium in ſe ſent deſiderium reconciliationis, never hunger nor thirſt after righteouſneſs; do not deny themſelves, not renounce their luſts, not deſpiſe all things for Chriſt.* Loe what Saints theſe are, Saints and it were for the *black Rubrick*; ſuch *Saints* as never had (ſaith the Synod) *fidem vivam, & ἀνυπόκριτον*, the peculiar of the *elect*.

thinks here I ſee how you fall preſently upon the ſecure Synod, and twit their weakneſs, with forgetting what they ſaid of late, of *fides minime ſimulata*, found in theſe your rare Saints of the *Hagiomaſtical Canonization*: But it is preſently anſwered, that *fides Dogmatica*, is *one*, and *Practica another*; they might unfeignedly aſſent to much of the *Doctrine* held forth in the word of God, but ſo as to *detain the truth in unrighteouſneſs*; their *apprehenſions* of the *Doctrine*, were not ſeconded with ſuitable *applications*. The *Doctrine* in their *heads*, was not attended with a *fit uſe* in their *hearts*; they cleanſed the *outer man commendably*, the *inner* part *perfunctorily*; they did but ſlightly *wipe*, inſtead of *bruſhing*; or but *bruſh* inſtead of *rubbing*; or *rubbed* it too *gently*, for fear of *rending*, which alone could *amend* it. They gave, if you pleaſe, an *unfeigned conſent* to the *Doctrine*, but did not *ſeriouſly enough conſider it*; and the *more* they *conſider it*, the *leſs* they *affect* it, as diſcovering how it *thwarteth* and *croſſeth* their *boſome-luſts*, and many of which they account not *ſins againſt God*, but a kind of *duties* to *themſelves*. Shortly they do *unfeignedly aſſent to the truth* at firſt ſight, and at a diſtance, but they do not *ſoundly apprehend it*; and the *more* they know *whereto it tends*, the *leſs* they think it worth the *following*, and at laſt alwaies forſake it, and ſometimes oppoſe it; yea now and then feigne an *ignorance of that*, whereto they formerly gave *an unfeigned aſſent*. Theſe forſooth are your *true believers*. Yea but [the Scripture (ſay you) makes not only the collection, or joynt concurrence of the particulars ſpecified, a diſtinguiſhing character of true and ſound believers, from thoſe who are not ſuch; but ſome of them even ſingly and apart from others: As 1. a *true and unfeigned belief or aſſent unto the things revealed by God in the Goſpel*,] yes, if you underſtand it of *all the main things*; but that theſe your *true believers* did *truly aſſent* to *all theſe*, who can believe; who conſiders how they prefer their accommodations in *this world*, before the glory of *that to come*? how far they are from thinking that the *gaining* of *heaven*, is worth the *loſing* of what they have on *earth*; that *ſuffering for Chriſt* is an *happineſs*; and that *all they have*, is worth *nothing*, but only in this reſpect, *that they have ſomewhat to leave for Chriſt*?

Well, but to prove that a true and unfeigned belief of the things revealed by God in the Goſpel, is of it ſelf a character of a true believer, [you quote John 20. 31. *Theſe things are written that you might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name.*] And how manage you this Text?

Why [1. There is nothing more evident, then that the word of God doth report and declare, that *Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God.*] undeniable.

[1. It is here plainly aſſerted, that to believe this (at leaſt with a true and unfeigned belief) is available unto life or ſalvation.] True, *available*, that is *conducing*; but what, *available* ſo as to to be *ſufficient*? It is well you explain your ſelf, [*to believe this with a true and unfeigned belief*;] but what is that? To believe that we were all of our ſelves liable to eternal death, and under an utter impoſſibility of being delivered, either by what our ſelves, or any other creature could do or ſuffer; that God out of his infinite mercy, ſent his Son to die in our ſtead, by his death to purchaſe our pardon, yea adoption for us, that *we might be made the ſons of God, and heirs of an everlaſting kingdom in heaven*, where both our *ſouls*, after their *diſſolution* from our *bodies*, and our *bodies*, after their *reſurrection* out of the *duſt*, ſhall be partakers of unconceiveable and endleſs glory; that hereupon we owe God our ſelves, our ſouls and bodies, and are happie in being enabled by his *grace*, to employ our ſeveral faculties and members in his *ſervice*; and more in being honoured to *ſuffer* the moſt fearfull meaſure from *men*, for being *faithfull* to *God*. This is all included in *believing that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God*, as is declared in Scripture.

Now I ask 1. Do you conceive that every one that unfeignedly aſſents to this truth, *that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God*, taken in the *lump*, doth as truly aſſent to *all the truths* that are neceſſarily *involved* in it? Poſſibly a man may aſſent to that truth, *that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God*, for the ſake of the world; as the caſe ſtands at preſent among us, and upon an apprehenſion that wiſer men among us ſee juſt

ground

round for it, as generally ſubſcribing this truth, although he ſee little or none: that this is rather not to expreſs a diſſent, then unfeignedly to aſſent to it. But whoſoever *unfeignedly aſſent to the truth*, as I have opened it, with *a true faith*, ſhall ſurely be *ſaved*.

But 2. Do you think that theſe your *true believers* did *ſo* aſſent to it? Thoſe whom the Synod ſpeaks of, *never deſired reconciliation*, *never thirſted after righteouſneſs*, *never valued Chriſt before all things*; loe what kind of ſorry aſſent theſe men gave to the things declared in the Goſpel. Was this the faith [for the effecting or working whereof the Goſpel was written?] true, it was written to give even an aſſent at large, and *without ſuch an aſſent*, no ſalvation; but ſuch an aſſent is not *ſufficient* I trow to ſalvation? even *ſuch an aſſent* is *neceſſary*, but there is *another gates* aſſent *required* to ſalvation? Is it [to bring an evil and hard report on the Goſpel] to ſay ſuch an aſſent at large to it was *intended*, and yet ſuch was *not intended* as *ſufficient* to ſalvation?

Nay but you add [The ſame truth is aſſerted in many other places, 1 *John* 5.5. *Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jeſus is the Son of God?* To overcome the world, is an unqueſtionable character of a perſon juſtified, and in favour with God; and *whoſoever* ſaith *John believes that Jeſus is the Son of God, partakes in this glory*, is *victorious over the world.*] What? every one who believes at large, that *Jeſus is the Son of God*, after the proportion of thoſe believers ſpoken of, by the Synod, and ſo much pleaded for by you? How well theſe men *overcame the world* appears by this, that *they valued not Chriſt above all things*. Mark I pray, St. *John* ſaith not, *every one that believes that Jeſus is the Son of God, overcomes the world*; but *every one that overcomes the world*, *believeth that Jeſus is the Son of God*. None doe overcome the world without ſuch a *belief* at large, that belief is neceſſary to the *overcoming of the world*, it is not in the mean time ſufficient to it. *Who is he that overcomes the world, but he that ſo believes?* he ſaith not, *whoſoever believes and overcometh not the world*; and ſo though *ſuch believing alwaies go before overcoming the world*; yet alas, *overcoming the world* doth not *alwaies follow after ſuch a believing at large*, that *Jeſus is the Son of God*; as which I believe is at moſt but a humane faith.

You proceed, [Again the Lord Chriſt, having a little before his aſcenſion, Commiſſioned his Diſciples thus, *Go you into all the world*, *and preach the Goſpel unto every living creature*, he immediately ſubjoyneth, *He that believeth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved*; *but he that believeth not*, *ſhall be damned*. That believing which our Saviour here requireth, and unto which he promiſeth ſalvation, is doubtleſs no other faith or believing, but a true and unfeigned belief of that Goſpel, which his Apoſtles, in the words immediately preceding, were injoyned to preach unto the world.] Right; but that I had thought contained not only a *Hiſtory of Chriſt*, but the myſterie of *Godlineſs*. Now a man may poſſibly believ the firſt *after a faſhion*, and yet not the latter and a *Dogmatical* faith (which is that that the Synod ſpeaks of) is many times deſtitute of the company of *that faith* which *worketh by love*. And why may it not be ſaid without offence, that the *firſt faith*, though it be ſuch, as without which there is *no coming to heaven*, yet is not ſuch as will prevail to *bring any man thither*? What you ſay afterward of [A true and unfeigned admiſſion, or reception of the Goſpel; or all the Apoſtles preached into the heart and ſoul of a man, that it tranſlates a man from death to life, *&c.*] is all true, but impertinent. We deny that thoſe believers ſpoken of by the Synod, admitted the *main Doctrine of the Croſs of Chriſt into their ſouls*, the *neceſſity* that there was of *Chriſts death* for us, the neceſſity of *our dying with Chriſt*, the glory of *our ſuffering for him*, are myſteries which they were ſtrangers to, as not *ſeriouſly deſiring reconciliation*, *not denying themſelves*, *not prizing Chriſt above all things*, and ſo not holding *all things as dung* in compariſon of *him*.

Prove as much as you liſt, that [A faith, ſo true and cordial, as to be attended with incumbency on Chriſt, renouncing of the world, *&c.* is a true juſtifying faith, albeit (forſooth) that recumbency be not the eſſence, or as much as any part of this faith.] you do not help your ſelf, unleſs you prove theſe believers ſpoken of by the Synod, SECT. 27.

who did not ſeriouſly deſire reconciliation, nor heartily thirſt after righteouſneſs, had a *faith attended with a recumbency on Chriſt, and renouncing the world*; and what you quote gravely from *Melanchthon*, amidſt this heap of teſtimonies, abundantly ſhews that *notitia Hiſtoriæ* [the notice of the Hiſtories] as you render it moſt Clark-like, is not ſufficient. Faith that juſtifies is ſuch as is in the *heart*, as well as the *head*; no other faith juſtifies, but ſuch as is uſhered in with a *ſelf-condemnation*, and humble acknowledgment of the juſtice of God, in whatever ſentence he ſhould have pleaſed to have paſſed on us. Now whereas you tell us,

SECT. 28. That [The Remonſtrants never wound up their pens, to ſo high a ſtrain againſt the neceſſity of the Perſeverance of the Saints, as the Synod hath done, which affirms a neceſſity of the falling away of the *non electi*.]

I anſwer, That thoſe *non electi* are no Saints, but only in *profeſſion*, nor doth the Synod hold a neceſſity of their falling away from their *profeſſion* of Saintſhip, but a neceſſity of their *periſhing*, though they continue in that unſincere profeſſion; which though it be ſuch as renders them Saints in the eyes of men (which can take little cognizance of their hearts, and are in charity to judge the beſt) yet never approved them for ſuch unto God, whoſe pure eyes clearly diſcovered the falſeneſs of their hearts, when their profeſſion was at the faireſt. Their *aſſent* was but a kind of *aſſentation*; and they did but *flatter with their lips, and diſſemble in their double hearts*. So then the Synod hath not [ſtumbled at the ſtone of inexcuſableneſs] but Mr. *Goodwin* is unexcuſable for caſting theſe *ſtones*, or rather this *dirt* at them.

SECT. 29. I confeſs, had you proved that the *non electi*, had had true juſtifying faith by the confeſſion of the Synod, they had been guilty of your [Indictment] but this they expreſly deny to them, *Non electi huc uſque progreſſi ad ſtatum tamen adoptionis, & juſtificationis, nunquam perveniunt; ac proinde ex horum Apoſtaſia, perperam deducitur Sanctorum Apoſtaſia Suffr. Brit. de Quinto Art. Theſ.* 4.

Well but [they ſay of ſome of theſe *non electi*, that they have the true knowledg of God, and of Chriſt, or of God in Chriſt, in their mind, for what other knowledg they ſhould here mean, is not imaginable, but they mean it only of ſuch as they call Dogmatical, and that out of this knowledg, they may as oft as is needfull, is not this conſtantly and without turning aſide, act conformably? And what is this but to bring forth fruits worthy repentance, yea and to equalize the beſt and worthieſt of the Saints, in doing righteouſneſs, which the holy Ghoſt makes the moſt emphatical and unerring property or character of ſuch men?] Nay they ſay not that theſe *non electi* may out of this knowledg [as oft as is meet, act conformably to the Goſpel;] but that they did as oft as was meet, act conformably to *this knowledg*; but as *this knowledg* was but *Dogmatical*, ſo were their actions in conformity to it, ſomewhat, yea much below thoſe which a *practical knowledg* would have produced; and that they did not act [as oft as was need conformably to the Goſpel] appears by their Apoſtaſie. The Synod ſpeaks not of theſe *non electi* as being qualified to doe [as often as was needfull, yea or any time, according to the Goſpel;] but as oft and as far as was needful, *viz.* in *their judgments*. The Synod had been guilty, not only of [*Autocatariſie* againſt their judgment] as you charge them, but of ridiculous abſurdity and contradiction to common ſenſe, had they affirmed theſe *non electi* acted [as often as was needfull according to the Goſpel] and yet apoſtatized from it. To do righteouſneſs, it is true [is an unerring character of a Saint;] but then you muſt conſtrue it, of doing that which is righteous, as righteous, *righteouſly*, which, that ever theſe *non electi* did, is not ſaid by the Synod. *Actus eliciebant*, ſay they, *quoties opus erat conformiter*

Theſe actions, as conformable as they were for the *matter*, were not ſo for the *manner* of doing. And accordingly the Synod compares theſe acters of righteouſneſs to the *ſtony ground*, and that [the perſons Parabled thereby, were true Saints] as much as you boaſt, you have not at all proved. Let the Reader be pleaſed to compare your Arguments, and my Anſwers to them.

You

You draw up the ſum of this your Copious Digreſſion; but all the Particulars having been ſhewed to be but Ciphers, let any man judg how much the Total amounts to; only I muſt needs ſay, how little ſoever you have done, you have undertaken enough, and deſerve the honour of *magnis excidit auſis*: So may they all proſper, that ſhall preſume to ſet themſelves againſt the *faithfulneſs of God*, and *comfort of his Saints*, who repoſe all their hope, not in *their own performances*, which they are ready to abaſe even to hell, but in *Gods promiſes*, which are all *yea and amen*. He who *ſits in heaven*, hath engaged himſelf to bring every Saint on earth *thither*; the *great God* hath taken upon him, the *care* of the *leaſt of his little ones*; nor can his children diſhonour him more, then to think he will neglect it; ere *they can fall away*, *his word muſt paſs away*; ſooner ſhall *heaven and earth*, then the leaſt *tittle of it*. SECT. 30

I have now done with Mr. *Goodwin*, only I cannot be ſo uncivil, as not to ſay this at parting, That I have not been ſo much his *profeſſed adverſary*, But that I am much more his *devoted ſervant*, for thoſe excellent parts, which notwithſtanding all my pleaſantneſs with him, I do ſeriouſly acknowledg in him, and moſt heartily pray God, that they may be ſo ſanctified unto him, that he may have the happineſs to enjoy that precious priviledg of the Saints, which in this diſpute he hath ſo induſtriouſly ſtrained himſelf to oppoſe, and that we may both meet in heaven, where there will be no more controverſie between us.

In the mean time may every Saint ſay, *Return unto thy reſt O my ſoul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee. O what fearfull things hath he ſhewed me, yet did he return, and refreſh me, and bring me out of the depth of hell again. He hath delivered mine eyes from teans, and my feet from falling, that I might walk before him in the land of the living. Thou art his ſervant, the ſon of his handmaid, he hath broken thy bonds aſunder, therefore perform thou the vowes which thou madeſt to him in the daies of thy trouble, and ſet forth his goodneſs in the gates of the daughter of Sion. Let Iſrael rejoyce in him that made him, and let the children of Sion be joyfull in their King; for the Lord takes pleaſure in his people and the meek will he beautifie with ſalvation. The enemies thruſt ſore at us, that we may fall, but in the name of the Lord ſhal we deſtroy them. They compaſs us about like bees, but in the name of the Lord ſhall we deſtroy them. Let them that fear the Lord, truſt the Lord, he is their help and their ſhield. Let Iſrael hope in the Lord, he is their help and their ſhield: He keeps the feet of his Saints, and will exalt the horn of his anointed. He rebuketh even Kings for their ſakes, ſaying, Touch not mine anointed, and do my Prophets no harm, he gives his Angels charge over them as miniſtring Spirits to them, he preſerves them by his own power through faith to ſalvation, and glories to have his ſtrength made perfect in their weakneſs. Whom have we in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that we deſire beſides thee. Our fleſh and our heart fails, but thou art the ſtrength of our heart, and our portion for ever. Thou ſhalt uphold us by thy right hand, thou ſhalt lead us by thy grace, and after receive us to glory,*

2 Cor. 4.7. *We have this treaſure in earthen veſſels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.*

2 Cor. 12.9. *Moſt gladly will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Chriſt may reſt upon me.*

FINIS.

A

FESCUE

FOR A

Horne-Book,

OR AN

APOLOGY

FOR

UNIVERSITY-LEARNING,

AS NECESSARY FOR

COUNTREY-PREACHERS.

SINCE this Book was all wrought off the PRESSE; I had the opportunity to ſee a Digreſſion of Mr. *Hornes* againſt me; which though extream ſhrewd, is ſufficiently ſhort; ſo that as deſperately as it puſheth, it is ſo farre from *goring*, that it ſcarce *pricks* me. This piece of Maſter *Horne* is not as much as a *Thorne*.

First, It takes to taske an objection of mine againſt Mr. *Goodwin*, ingenuouſly confeſſing, that I propound it only as *Argumentum ad hominem*, and ſo it ſeemes lay no ſtreſſe on it as to the *matter* of it. Only this Digreſſor, 1. Apprehends, *It may ſeem to carry ſome ſhew of weight in it amongſt ſome of the Antipædobaptiſts, that believe the extent of Chriſts death and ranſome.* He ſhould have added ſome epithet to his *extent*, for want whereof I think few will know how to make out his *ſenſe*; *I trow all confeſſe an extent of Chriſts death*, the queſtion is, *how farre* it extends? And, 2. *Calls to minde, that it is a prime Argument amongſt ſome of them*; what is that to me? And thereupon, 3. Conceives it *very needful to ſhew its invalidity.* In good time. [*It is then* (ſaith he) *to this purpoſe.* Chriſt by his death and ſuffering, hath wholly diſſolved, and taken off from all men, the guilt and condemnation, that was brought on all men by *Adams* ſin, and ſo from all Infants, ſo as that none ſhall periſh now, but for his own perſonal ſinning againſt the Government and goodneſſe of God by Chriſt; Therefore as *Tertullian* ſayes, *Quid feſtinat innocens ætas ad remiſſionem?* ſeeing Infants are not in danger of periſhing nor

 have

have any ſin to be waſhed from, no need is there of their being baptized.

To this purpoſe is Mr. *Kendall's* reaſoning, once, and again, and particularly in *Chap.* 17. *pag.* 203. twice, and again, *pag.* 207.

To which I anſwer, (quoth he.)

1. By denying the conſequence, becauſe though Chriſt indeed hath died for all, and through his death, the *benefit is to all men to juſtification of life*, Rom. 5. 18. ſo as that there is ſalvation extendible to them, in the publick perſon, and tenderable to them in the Goſpel, &c. Though all this I ſay be ſo, yet it followes not either,

1. That Infants are guilty of, or have no ſin in them.
2. That Baptiſme (were it ſo) is needleſſe for, &c.]

I Reply,

I. That this rare Digreſſor, hath here propoſed my Argument, as King *JAMES* ſaid, a certaine quaint Dr. handled his Text, *right like a gentleman*; Had he dealt like a Scholar, and put it into moode and figure, he ſhould have ſaid thus: If Chriſt by his death and ſufferings have wholly diſſolved, and taken off from all Infants all the guilt, and condemnation that was brought on them by *Adams* ſin, then is there no need of their being baptized; But according to Mr. *Goodwin*, Chriſt hath done this; *Ergo* there is no need, according to Mr. *Gordwin*, of Infants being baptized

This had been a *Fair* putting my Argument into the *rough hand* of Logick, and ſo it would have appeared what Mr. *Goodwin* affirmed, what I inferred from this affirmation of Mr. *Goodwins*; how wiſely the Digreſſor oppoſeth my inference. But as he fumbleth ſome Readers might think I diſputed againſt the Baptiſme of Infants, and had either furniſhed theſe Antipædobaptiſts with a prime Argument, or furbiſhed up their prime Argument for them, whereas indeed I conclude, Antipædobaptiſme is an unhappy conſequence of this unwary affimation, *That Chriſt by his death and ſufferings took off the guilt and condemnation*, which was brought on all Infants by *Adams ſin*; and do not lay *this* as a ground to *prove Antipædobaptiſme*, but ſhew that that lying under, overthrowes *this ground of* my Digreſſors good friend. It is an happineſſe to have to do with a Scholaſtick Adverſarie.

II. Let the Reader be pleaſed to take notice how worthily this Digreſſor denieth the conſequence.

Saith he, [*Though Chriſt died for all, and through his death the benefit is to all men to juſtification of life*, Rom. 5. 18, &c. *So that there is ſalvation extendible to them in the publick perſon, and is tenderable to them in the Goſpel, &c. Yet it followes not.*

1. *That Infants are guilty of, or have no ſin in them*;] Be it ſo, but is this *my conſequence*, friend? or is it not Mr. *Goodwins aſſertion*? from which I draw this conſequence, *that then Baptiſme of Infants is needleſſe*. I ſee you are ſo ripe-witted, that you could write againſt all Univerſity-Learning, before you had learned your leſſon, as you ſhould have done in a *Colledge-Hall*. You may be allowed to talke liberally againſt the *old Philoſophy*, having a *new Logick* fallen to your own ſhare.

But next, have at my *conſequence*, and be falls about it thus.

[(1.) *The death of Chriſt for a man is ſo farre from rendering Baptiſme needleſſe to that man, that indeed there is no ground for baptizing any man, but by vertue of, and upon the account of Chriſts death for him.*]

True; but what if *Chriſts death be the ground of baptizing a man*, what is that to invalidate *this conſequence*, that *If Infants have no ſin to be waſht from*, Ergo *they need not be baptized?*

(2.) Well, but ſaith he, [*Baptiſme doth not take ſin out of the Nature, nor off of the conſcience.*]

What if it were ſo? yet were this no prejudice to *my conſequence*; *If Infants*

Infants had no ſin to be waſhed off, it were needleſſe to baptize them. For though *Baptiſme as waſhing with water take not off ſin*, yet it ſignifies (I trow) *Gods taking off the guilt of ſin*, and *the pollution of it* alſo in his time. Now if *Infants have neither*, (which Mr. *Goodwin* affirmes) *Baptiſme ſignifying Gods taking both off* is needleſſe.

That which you adde, of *Baptiſme declaring to* Cornelius,

1. *His hearty cloſing with the Lord Jeſus, and his real repentance of his former practices.*

2. *His receiving the external Seale, or ratification of forgiveneſſe of ſins to the Believer.*

3. *A miniſterial forgiveneſſe, or waſhing them away, ſo as to be no longer reckoned a perſecutor*; Were it all *true*, is yet all as impertinent I trow in the caſe of *Infants*, who ſure were never *perſecutors*; and being no more then *Infants*, will not eaſily be proved *Believers*. But,

3. Say you, *The having ſin taken away from men in point of obnoxiouſneſſe to puniſhment, or off their conſciences, yea, the putting a man into ſuch a condition, as in which he is actually capable of ſalvation, and ſo the rendering Baptiſme not neceſſary to ſalvation, doth not take away the need of Baptiſme, or make that the adminiſtration of it ſhould be groundleſſe.*

Right ſtill; but all *awry* from *my Argument*, for albeit I yield that Baptiſme is not neceſſary to ſalvation, *neceſſitate medii*; yet you will grant it is neceſſary, *neceſſitate præcepti*; but this *precept* is founded in the *ſin of Infants*, which if *they have none to be waſhed off*, are not within compaſſe of the *command* of Baptiſme, which is a *ſigne of the waſhing off of ſin*. And indeed Mr. *Goodwin* doth not only deny *ſin in Infants*, but denies them any *capacity of Regeneration*; they are ſo *innocent* forſooth, and ſo *no need of Baptiſme* at all, according to *his grounds*. And if Baptiſme were but a ſigne of *this*, that *Chriſts death took off their ſin*, and it took it off from all Infants, (before they had it belike) *all Infants* may as well be baptized as *any*; and ſo not onely the Infants of *Chriſtians*, but *Pagans* alſo, are *holy*, and may be *equally admitted* to Baptiſme, as they *equally partake* in CHRISTS death according to Mr. *Goodwin*.

And this his Hyperaſpiſtes is all as charitable to Infants, witneſſe his taking it in ſuch dudgeon, that *I was ſo raſh as to ſay ſome Infants* ſhall bow their little guilty knees in hell, *he is ſure no Scriptures tell me ſo*, none do indeed in the *ſame words*, there are *ſome* that ſpeak to the *ſame purpoſe*, as that none can enter into the Kingdom of heaven, unleſs they be regenerated, which Mr. *Goodwin* ſaith, Infants are capable of, who can prove *that all receive*? But it is enough for this Reverend Brother, to deliver his *judgement* without vouchſafing to adde his Reaſon, as he gravely doth in what he ſubjoynes, that *my Doctrine* forſooth *is he thinks far more obnoxious to doubts and ſcruples about Infant-Baptiſme, then the other*. It ſhall ſuffice me to ſay, he may be better at *doubts* and *ſcruples*, then *Arguments* and *Anſwers*.

But now, *Cornu ferit ille, Caveto.* Well,

Per tamen adverſi gradiemur cornua tauri.

I know the worſt of it, ſuch *creatures* are not wont to *bite*, as not being armed with *teeth* in their *upper jawes*; and therefore ſeeing, he will but toſſe me a little rudely as upon his *horne*, I will overcome him with kindneſſe, and toſſe him more genteely as in a *blanket*.

[Concerning his Doctrine (ſaith he) Mr. KENDALL is more beholding to his Metaphyſicks, then to the Scriptures, for his belief and maintenance of it. As not onely his Book throughout, but his own poſitive confeſſion therein, *Chap.* 16: *pag.* 159. declare; where he ſayes it was his laying a good foundation in Logick, and Metaphyſicks that kept him upright in theſe controverſies of Divinity. See, I pray, upon what a good foundation that Doctrine is built and upheld; not upon the onely good, and ſure foundation of the Prophets and Apoſtles, *Eph.* 2. 19, 20. whom he plainly confeſſeth, Chriſt never ſent to preach Metaphyſical Lectures,

but upon Philoſophy, which the Apoſtle bids us *beware of, leſt it ſpoile us in the matters of our faith*, telling us it is but the *vaine deceit of man*; and however ſolid, and ſubſtantial it ſeem to be, it will but *deceive* us. *Col.* 2. 8.]

Why, what if my laying ſuch a foundation, as I did in Logick and Metaphyſicks, *helped to keep me upright in theſe controverſies*, (for thoſe are my words;) was therefore the *foundation of my Doctrine laid on them?* A mans *ſtaffe* helps to keep him upright in his walk, *Ergo* belike he walkes *upon his ſtaffe*. And a *Buttreſſe* helpes to keep a wall *upright*, *Ergo* by this Logick, it is the *foundation of the Wall*; that the foundation which I laid in Logick, and the Metaphyſicks, help to keep me upright in theſe controverſies, is *true*, that the foundation of my Doctrine is laid on it, is *falſe*. This helped to keep me from not being *overthrowne*; Good Sir, it follows not I *build upon it*. Mens oppoſition of our Doctrine upon ſuppoſed Metaphyſical grounds, makes the knowledge of Logick and the Metaphyſicks neceſſary for the *defence* of the truth, though elſe it had not been for the *delivery* of it. Chriſt, it is true ſent not his Apoſtles to preach Metaphyſical Lectures to us; but now that ſubtile men have *corrupted the Doctrine* which the Apoſtles preacht, with *Metaphyſicall ſpeculations*, It is neceſſary for us to ſtudy the Metaphyſicks, that we may be enabled to *diſcover* thoſe *Metaphyſical vanities*, and to *vindicate* the *Apoſtles Doctrine*. This one conſideration ſufficeth to confute all thoſe ten worſhipful Arguments, which you hereafter produce againſt Philoſophy, as not neceſſary for the Preachers of the Goſpel. It is I yield not neceſſary for the *preaching of the truth*, it is for the *confuting of Error*; which (I trow) is a *neceſſary part* of the *Preachers work*.

We look on Logick and Metaphyſicks, not as neceſſary to the *promulgation* of the *ſimple truth* of the Goſpel, but as neceſſary to the *clearing* of it from *crafty objections*. The Apoſtle while he cautions the *Coloſſians*, againſt *vain Philoſophy*, meanes Philoſophy as imployed *againſt* the truth, not as imployed *in the ſervice* of it, in ſhewing the *vanity* of thoſe that *corrupt* it.

This is the uſe I make of my little skill in Logick, and the Metaphyſicks; without which ſurely, I had not been in a better [capacity of making an anſwer to Maſter *Goodwins* Book] then you are to mine. And hereupon it was that I held it my duty, to recommend the ſtudy of Philoſophy to the younger ſtudents of *Exeter Colledge*.

And I ſay it again, that without theſe ſtudies, as unprofitable as they ſeem in the eyes of your learned Cenſorſhip; no other ſtudies will ever be profitable to them, in that work, whereunto theſe Gentlemen are chiefly appointed by their ſtatutes, the maintenance of our juſtly received Doctrine.

Had I not too much cauſe to give them this ſhort counſel, when ſo many Mates of yours, ſo loudly cried down all this kinde of learning, as Antichriſtian, and would not by their good will have left us a Smith in *Iſrael*, to new-grinde our Culters, much leſſe to ſharpen our ſwords, while too many hoſtes of the Philiſtines were upon our borders, ready to invade us; yea, ſome of them got into the bowels of our Nation, in the habit of the trueſt *Iſraelites*, ready to maſſacre us? As zealous as you are againſt the Antipædobaptiſts in the *maine battel*; you little think I hope how your *Reare* betraies us at once, both to the Anabaptiſts and Papiſts. And as paſſionately as you cry out, *Oh what is become*, Paul, *of thy aſſertion of the Scriptures ſufficiency, to make us profitable to every purpoſe*, You unawares leave the *Scriptures* at the mercy of their new Adverſaries, while you bereave us of thoſe *weapons*, whereby alone we can deliver the Scriptures out of the hands of their profeſſed enemies.

The Scriptures, Good Sir, furniſh us with *materials*, we muſt be beholding to Logick, for the putting thoſe materials into the *forme* of Argument. The Scriptures yield us our *ſtuffe*, we uſe Logick for the cutting of it in *due ſhape and proportion*.

But though hitherto you have onely uſed a *packſtaffe*; yet now you begin to be witty in laying about me with my *Metaphyſical meteyard and ſheares*, as you call them; and you ſhew how I make uſe of my *Meteyard to meaſure out the Eſſence*, *and*

and nature of God, the manner of his willing, knowing, acting, and the dependency of all things and actions thereupon by my rules, of effects, and defects, and applications of them to the truths of the Gospel.

Alas, Sir, I use my Meteyard to shew the *immensity* of God, and that the *wit of man* is not capable of *measuring* him. I make it my businesse to demonstrate, that his Essence, and Nature, the manner of his knowing, willing, and acting, are at an unmeasurable distance beyond all our weak apprehensions.

I shew that *that manner* of knowing, willing, and acting, which your great Dr. ascribes to God, would cast a shadow of *imperfection* upon him; and in all these particulars, I advance the excellencies of God above humane conceits; I do not presume to *measure* them by my short *Meteyard*. I know the *understanding of man* to be *finite*, and therefore in all humility acknowledge it not capable of measuring out the *infiniteness* of God. I essay to demonstrate the dependance of all things, and actions upon Gods will, the depths of Gods wayes beyond the fathoming of mans understanding; and apply my rules of effects, and defects, to the workings of God, so as to attribute all *effects* to *him*, all *defects* to *our selves*; so as that God only *permits* them, *we* alone are *chargeable* with them. What presumption I pray is this to use my Metaphysical Meteyard, so as to shew the shortnesse of mans notions, and that they do not reach unto many of Gods truths?

2. He addes, [I use my Metaphysical sheeres, to as limit, and shorten the truths of the Gospel most gallantly, and to leave us but a little of that truth and goodnesse they seem to have in them.] But

He may know I cut off nothing, but such rags as the phancies of men have unworthily patcht upon them; nor do the truthes of God look ever the lesse like themselves, for having such *unworthy supplements* pared from them.

I do not *shorten* any truth of the Gospel, but endeavour to reduce it to its *true staple*; whereas they who stretch it further, instead of making it *longer* and *broader*, make it *thinner*, then to give any comfortable warmth to a poor soule.

He sayes truer then he is aware, that [I leave little of that truth and goodnesse which they seem to have in them.] I take off nothing that was *really* in them; and had he considered my discourses, he should have found them truly comfortable to *poor Saints*, though they pretend not to comfort *unbelieving sinners*.

Those Texts which he saith I have *snipt*, I have indeed *unfolded*, but cut off only those flitters of interpretations, which Mr. *Goodwin* had drawne out; Nor did I handle my sheeres, otherwise then as *Whitaker*, *Reynolds* here, and *Calvin*, *Beza*, *&c.* abroad, had taught me; To say nothing of the Synod of *Dort*, wherein were convened those excellent men who were the glory of the Reformed Churches, or the Assembly at *Westminster*, which certainly consisted of other guesse Work men, then such as are free of the New Company of Theologicall *Merchant-Taylors*.

It had been happy for Mr. *Horne*, he had served as their *apprentice*, rather then turned *Journey-man* under Mr. *Goodwin*; who I doubt not may in a just chafe chance, to lay the Meraphysical Meteyard over his sconce; for casting out that which tends more to *his* disparagement then *mine*. For who (I beseech you) dealt first in these Metaphysical commodities? My Metaphysical Meteyard was content to lie as quietly as *Goliahs* Sword by the Ephod, in the Country, and had not appeared in the world, had it not been called out to examine the falseness of Mr. *Goodwins yard*, which pretending to give the Saints a *larger measure* of comfort out of these Texts, then they desired, cunningly turnes *them off* with a *shorter* then comes to their share.

But, could the good Gentleman think, that his saying that [I expound *all* in several Texts by all sorts of men,] whereas he and his Master would have it understood of all *particular men*, or that I expound *World* by *Elect*, in others, is a confuting of me? yes, marry he confutes me most undeniably, by gainsaying my conclusion, without vouchsafing to answer my

Reaſons. What may he not hope to bear down, who dare ſtrikes at all the *Schooles* that teach Philoſophy in order to Divinity, and all the *Pulpits* that make uſe of it in her ſervice? *Fœnum habet in Cornu*, and that as it ſhewes his fierceneſſe, ſo it prevents the miſchief of it, as I ſhall demonſtrate in its place, before I have done with him.

But for the preſent, I take notice of his exceptions againſt my ſheeres for ſnipping, *Ezek.* 33. 11. [making it run but even with the perſons ſpoken to, the houſe of *Iſrael*, forgetting the mood *Darii*, that particular applications may be well made from general propoſitions.]

My words are theſe, *Surely it reſpects not all wicked men, for it is ſpoken only to the houſe of Iſrael.* Now wherein will the mood *Darii* remember me of an overſight? why, that mood tells me, [Particular application may be made from a general propoſition,] very true; but no *generall application* from a *particular propoſition.*

Now here the *propoſition is particular*, and reſpects onely the houſe of *Iſrael*, and ſo concernes not *all men all the world* over.

I yield, *that* which is ſpoken to the houſe of *Iſrael*, may concerne *all men all the world over* but I trow not *quatenus*, it is *ſpoken only to the houſe of Iſrael*, and of it; as well he may ſay, All that I ſpeak only to Mr. *Goodwins* Church, and of it concernes all the Congregations in *London*, that at *Aldermanbury*, as well as that at *Colemanſtreet.*

2. For cutting, 2 *Chron.* 36. 15. [and thereby all the dependance of Gods ſending the Prophets, and Meſſengers upon any compaſſion in him as the cauſe of it; whereas indeed Gods ſending his Prophets, was according to this Meteyard, the cauſe of his compaſſion towards them; For he did but reſpit their deſtruction, till he ſhould ſend them his Word and Prophets; and therefore ſure had it not been for that, he would not have reſpited them.]

Hold I beſeech you; be it yielded, God did but reſpit their deſtruction till he ſhould ſend them his Word and Prophets; let it be added, that therefore ſure had it not been for that, he would not have reſpited it; it followes not that therefore his ſending his Prophets was the *cauſe* of his *compaſſion*, though it were the *cauſe of reſpiting their deſtruction.* It is one thing to ſpeak of compaſſion as a *poſitive immanent* act, another of *reſpiting deſtruction*, which is but the *negation of a tranſient act*: Though his ſending his Prophets were yielded to be the *cauſe of this*, it followes not it was the *cauſe of that*; *that*, good Sr. was, being an *immanent* act eternal, and depended not on any cauſe *without*; *this* being the *negation of a tranſient act in time*, depended on the *cauſa prohibens*, which being removed, their deſtruction hitherto reſpited, did ſoon follow.

And what if I had ſaid, [this reſpiting their deſtruction, proceeded from a *purpoſe to bring many of them to a greater ruine?*] Doth not the Apoſtle ſay, that *God that he might ſhew his wrath, endured with much long-ſuffering the veſſels fitted to deſtruction?* Rom. 9.

He would perſwade his Reader, [I make little better then a ſcare-crow of *Pauls* bidding us beware, *leſt we deſtroy a weak brother*, as if he bade him beware of ſhooting down *Pauls* with an arrow,] his ſhaft is ſoon ſhot, and returnes (as ſuch wiſe Archers arrowes are wont to do) upon his own head. It is enough that a man may wiſely enough be bid to beware how he ſhoot againſt *Pauls*, leſt he *wound himſelf*, though *Pauls* be not like to *be pierced by him*; but I have ſpoken at large of this Scripture, and to better purpoſe then that this ſhaft ſhould wound my Expoſition.

In another place he makes himſelf merry, but indeed rather a merriment to his Reader, ſhewing how [it is poſſible blinde men may look towards an object with their blinde eyes, that they may ſee,] abuſing that Text, *Eſay* 42. 18. to this purpoſe; forgetting all the while, that that is ſpoken of ſuch blinde men as were not *corporally*, but *ſpiritually* blinde; now a *ſpiritual blindneſſe* may well enough conſiſt with an *intellectual quick-ſightedneſſe* in ſuch matters, as being conſidered, would ſerve to *checke* them, though not to *convert* them; but I was ſpeaking of *corporall* blindneſſe, to which this cannot in any tolerable ſenſe be applied.

His

His nibbling about my ſenſe of *Matth.* 23.37. is as little to be feared? nor need I trouble my ſelf to take off his exception from [the Canons *alias* of *Eſdras*,] or [Chriſts not coming often as man to the Jewes in his manhood,] he came ſo as to take manhood but once; but I trow he came *in his manhood* often, and his endeavouring as man to gather them whom as God he intended not to gather, is avouched by too many Authors, for one line of this Dr. to wipe off.

Certainly no good man will give much credit to him, who will not endure to have *his* [*faith attributed to Chriſt as a part of his purchaſe*,] which Mr. *Horn* cannot away with. It ſeemes he lookes not on his faith as a *ſpiritual bleſſing*, nor prayes for an increaſe of it *in the Name of Chriſt*, nor bleſſeth God for it as *his gift* for *Chriſts ſake*. Next Sir, whatever your think, Gods decree to bring men to glory, excludes not the *meanes*; among which Chriſts death, and our faith purchaſed by it, are the chief; the value of Chriſts purchaſe, andan obligation thereby on his Father, hath been ſhewed by me to be conſiſtent enough with ſuch an Election, as I following the ſteps of the moſt eminent Divines in the Chriſtian Church, do aſſert.

Them I have going before me in my Expoſition of the 2 *Peter* 2. 1. againſt which Mr. *Horn* only flouriſheth, but doth not ſtrike; nor indeed doth he all along at any Argument of mine, ſave only that he thruſts at myconſtruction of 2 *Chro.* 28. 23. *Ahaz worſhipped the gods of Damaſcus, which ſlew him*, that it's ſpoken as in his opinion only; I yield [*Tremelius* reades, *diis Damaſcenorum percutientium eum.*] But why *Damaſcenorum* ſhould be put for *Damaſci*, and *percutientium* put for *percutientibus*, and *percutientium* in the *plural number* relate to *Damaſci*, or *Damaſcenorum* be ſubſtituted in the place of *Damaſci*, no reaſon is rendred.

But I give this reaſon, why all this is to be underſtood of the *gods*, not the *men* of *Damaſcus*, that *Ahaz* ſaid in the words *adjoyning*, *Becauſe the gods of Aſſyria helped them, therefore will I ſacrifice unto them.* Let theſe gods be devils, and the Devil it is true ſmote *Job* by the hands of the *Sabeans*, yet that caſe and this is not alike; the Devil had there a *particular commiſſion*, that he had ſo *here* is not ſaid, cannot be proved; and whatever the Devils may do as *Devils*, as *gods* (under which notion *Ahaz* here worſhipped them) they never do any thing.

In concluſion he ſaith, [I deal with few Scriptures in this Controverſie, but I miſerably clip them;] I do not *clip* them, but *roll* them *cloſer*, ſo as they *weigh* the *more* in the ballance of the *Sanctuary*, whereas thoſe *extenſions* of his aſſociates render them the *lighter*; as ſome things have the luck to *loſe* of their *weight*, by having their *breadth enlarged*; he may experiment it in a piece of *gold* beaten out into a *ſheet*. To let paſſe [the honeſty of his Taylors Meteyard and Sheares,] he ſaith, [I might have afforded the Students a Philoſophicall Needle of a piercing tongue, and Gooſe of a preſſing wit, and then they might have been fit to do leſſe harme on a Shop-board, then in a Pulpit, with their worldly Rudiments, and humane Divinity.]

I wonder he mentioned not a *thimble* too to preſerve their fingers ends, leſt they fouſe them with ſuch *pieces*, and a *ſcering candle* to burne off their threeds, when they are faine to work on ſuch courſe ſtuffe as he ſends to them.

All this is but light froth; and whereas he tells us, [it is a bit to ſtay ſtomacks till Mr. *Goodwin* ſhall provide a fuller Meale of Reply;] Sure it may rather *ſtay ſtomacks*, then ſet *mouthes* a watering after Mr. *Goodwins Meal*: And therefore he had juſt cauſe to crave the Readers, and eſpecially Mr. *Goodwins* pardon, who is like to have his full Meal lie on his hands, this *bit* being enough to take away ſtomacks; but the more it takes away *others ſtomacks*, the more it may fill Maſter *Goodwins ſtomack*, ſo as that he may be like enough to reward this *bit* with a *knock*. For marrie the Gentleman, after another *vagarie* about the vanity of Philoſophy to the ſame purpoſe with the former, aſſumes the boldneſſe to adviſe Mr. *Goodwin* [to let go his Metaphyſical weapons, (intimating, he can no better wield theſe weapons, then *David* did wear *Sauls* harneſſe,) and to betake himſelf to the ſmooth ſtones of the Brook, ſuch as he himſelf hath ſent] with a vengeance into the forehead of one [*Goliah*,] that preſumed to deal with Maſter *Goodwins* and diſdained to draw

upon

upon this his Squire. Sir, the Reaſon why Mr. *Goodwin* makes no more of his weapons, is this, that his cauſe is no better; he makes as much of his weapons as any man that I wot of can do; and were their mettal good, he could handle them with the beſt, as he makes the moſt of many ſmall matters. The more I wonder what aild this bold Britain, to take up a plaine Countreymans *cudgel*, while he deſires Mr. *Goodwin* to give up the beſt of his *weapons*. The mans head akes to be knockt, and though he would diſſemble it, yet it irkes him, that Mr. *Owen* would not foule his fingers with him; and the truth is, Mr. *Owen* need not be too buſie about his works, which have layne ſo idle theſe foure years; that he heredirects his Reader to three ſhops, where he that hath a minde to them, may be ſure to find great bundles of theſe Horn-books at any time; the rare venter of ſuch commodities, keeping them ſo charily, that no ordinary cuſtomer is ever likely to come by any of them. The *ſubſtance* of the man not doing the feat, he tries how he can ſet himſelf out better, by being Mr. *Goodwins ſhadow*.

But he carries it ſo untowardly, that he doth enough to make all the Students in the Univerſities, to look on him as their common enemy, by decrying Philoſophy, without which it ſeemes he can finde means to *preach*, they know no way to *diſpute*, *whatever* this *Diſputaciſſimum animal* doth adventure to do. Well attend we him, how well he will lay about it.

His Objections then againſt Philoſophy are reduceable to two principal heads.

Firſt, the vanity of Philoſophy, in *it ſelf*, which he eſſaies to ſhew,

1. In generall,
2. In ſome particulars of it, made uſe of by me in my Book.

Secondly, the uſeleſſeneſs of Philoſophy to the Preachers of the Goſpel, which he endeavours to make out, by no fewer then ten Arguments, which have all of them never a horne; but are rather as ſo many buſhes, wherein he hath caught himſelf as faſt as ever *Abrahams* Ram was; and may be a ſeaſonable ſacrifice to help expiate all the bold attempts of all the Aſſaſinates of Learning, which this age hath produced.

Well, great *weights* are hung by God upon ſmall *wires*; and I know not but all the enemies of the Schooles, may chance to be hung up together upon this one though a *weak horne*, being planted in a good *ſtrong forehead*.

And therefore as ridiculouſly as he miſbehaves himſelf in his buſhing at all learning, that is called to come in and help the Preachers of the Goſpel, I intend to deal ſeriouſly in the defence of it.

1. Then to what he ſaith of the vanity of Philoſophy in *it ſelf*.

And firſt in *general*, I think Philoſophy need not complain of being diſparaged by him, in ſaying, the ſtudents [*ſhould do farre better to ſtudy the Scriptures well*.]

I ſay as much; *their doing better to ſtudy the Scriptures well*, inferres not they ſhould do *amiſſe*, to ſtudy Philoſophy perhaps *more* then they do; no more then when I ſay, a man ſhall do *better* to begin his buſineſſe in the morning with *prayer*; I inferre he doth *amiſſe* in taking a *cruſt, and cup of beare* for his Breakfaſt; or in ſaying a man ſhould do *better* to look well after his *ſoul*, I inferre he doth *amiſſe* in taking a due care of his *body*. They ſhall indeed do *better* to *ſtudy the Scriptures well*, *Epiſtle the ſecond to the Colloſſians*, more then any Chapter of the *Metaphyſicks*; doth it follow they do *amiſſe* to ſtudy *Ariſtotle*, becauſe they ſhall do farre *better* to ſtudy *Paul* well? Sir, I look in this caſe, on *Ariſtotle*, as a *ſervant* to *Paul*; and though they ſhall do farre *better* to wait on the *Maſter*, I hope they do not *amiſſe* to informe themſelves a little by the *man*, of ſuch things as it's below the dignity of the *Maſter* for them to expect he ſhould give them an account of them *himſelf*. Such are thoſe *punctilio's* for which we referre them to Philoſophy, not for *materials*, but for *tools*. We hold for true, and certain, as much as this, or any other man, *that in the myſtery of God, Father, and Chriſt, as preached in the Goſpel, are hid all the treaſures of Wiſdome, and knowledge; and that in Chriſt we are compleatly furniſhed*,

ſted as well for wiſdome, and profiting one another, as for righteouſneſſe:] But I truſt *he* had not been ſo *compleatly furniſhed* as he is, unleſſe he had been beholding to the *Grammar-Schoole*, which he is content to allow as *neceſſary*, at great a ſpight as he hath at the *Logick-Schoole*. Marry he confeſſeth in the upſhot, [*That the tongues have their more uſefulneſſe, becauſe the Scripture was writ in other languages; but they are diſtinct things from Philoſophy.*] They are I will be his witneſſe, for he himſelf hath much more *tongue* then Reaſon. We ſay as well as *he*, that [*as we have no need to turne aſide to the Law of* Moſes *to make us righteous, ſo neither have we to turne aſide to Philoſophy, and the vain deceits of men, to make us wiſe unto ſalvation.*] But,

(1.) Though we need not turne aſide *to* the Law of *Moſes*, ſo as to *depend* on it, to make us *righteous*; yet we ſhall never be righteous if we turne aſide *from* the Law of *Moſes*, ſo as to *neglect* it. The like ſay we of Philoſophy, we have *ſufficient uſe of it*, though we do not expect *a ſufficiency from it* to make us *wiſe to ſalvation*; we have uſe of it to make us *wiſe* ſo farre, as to know how many would *abuſe* it, ſo as to *fool* us out of ſalvation.

(2.) Though we have uſe of Philoſophy, it followes not of the [*vain deceit of men,*] The neceſſary truths in Philoſophy, are at a competent diſtance from the *vain deceits* of Philoſophers. We have need to *turne aſide* from *theſe*, and we have need of the help of *theſe*, to keep us from being turned aſide by *theſe*.

The blade, that knowes not how to diſtinguiſh between *Philoſophy and the vain deceits of men*, will belike confound a good *honeſt trade*, and the falſe *juglings* of crafty *knaves* in the managing of it. The honeſt Tradeſmen, though they be not too much acquainted with the Metaphyſical Meteyard, yet would eaſily finde an inſtrument in their Shop, wherewith to teach him much better Logick.

(3.) He may know that there is ſome neceſſary uſe to be made of the *knowledge of vain deceits*; and ſo it is a very *honeſt piece* of Logick, that imployes it ſelf in the Doctrine concerning *Fallacies*. It is (I truſt) of ſome advantage to *true men*, to be acquainted with the tricks of *ſharkes*.

(4.) When the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the *Rudiments of the World*, and *traditions of men*, he underſtands ſuch as preſume to *order* the affaires of the *worſhip of God*, not ſuch as are uſed like *Gibeonites*, and imployed in the drawing of water, and cutting of wood for the Sanctuary.

There is danger, I confeſſe, of our being *ſpoiled from Chriſt* by ſuch Platonical Philoſophy, as is now much in faſhion in ſome Colledges; *this* the more it *apes* Divinity, the more it *corrupts* it; but *that* kinde of Philoſophy which teacheth the formes of arguing, *the* natures of termes, neceſſarily uſed in arguing, as it pretends not to ought but what is commonly applicable to *all ſciences*, ſo it is not like to *ſpoile us from Chriſt*, and the *ſimplicity of the Goſpel*. *Ariſtotle* as he pretended *leſſe devotion*, ſo he hath leſſe *corrupted Religion* then his, and your old Doctors Maſter *Plato*, and I am ready to make it good, that *Ariſtotle* is oppoſed more then underſtood, by a greater Sophy then your ſelf, and one whoſe *ſcales* are ſtronger then moſt *hornes*; the great *Leviathan*, the very *Dagon* of many young Squires, or Squirrels.

But what if [*Plato's Philoſophy preſume to pry* into the Eſſence of God, his nature and manner of willing, knowing, &c.] what is this to *Ariſtotles Priorum*, and *Poſteriorum*, and *Topicks*, and *Categories*, or to *Porphyries quinque predicabilia*? you are angry, that by the help of thoſe *poor notions*, I diſcover the vanity of your great Doctors admired *ſpeculations*.

If [*Menander, Manes, Ebion, &c. have been led into their errors, by occaſion of their curioſity, and Phyſical ſpeculations,*] we ſay they underſtood Philoſophy, as little as Theology; and were it not for Logick, which way would you ſhew the *nonconcluding* of their Arguments? They could quote Scriptures as readily as ſome of your friends, the enemies of Philoſophy; Logick ſhewed their deductions from thoſe Scriptures, were as *irrationall*, as *irreligious*.

Philoſophy, is I grant [*good for nothing, when unſoberly uſed;*] but neither is he *ſober*, that ſayes it cannot be put to *excellent uſe*, in opening points of Divinity; nay, do not *you* tell us, that [*there are ſeveral things couched in Scriptures, where they are not expreſſed; and that thoſe things ſo couched are no leſſe true then if they were expreſſed?*]

Index. Now how do you draw out *thoſe things which are ſo couched, and all as true as if they were expreſſed*, Logically, or Illogically? If Illogically, you do it *irrationally*; If Logically, I pray ſpeak no more againſt that *uſefull piece* of Philoſophy.

This ſhall ſuffice for what he ſaith of the vanity of Philoſophy in generall. Now,

Secondly, For thoſe particulars of it, made uſe of in my Book.

Saith the new RABBI, [*Our purblinde reaſon is not able to give us good ſatisfaction about the conſiſtency of their principles with themſelves*]: As firſt, that *Deus eſt actus purus, ſimpliciſſimus*, and there is not *aliud, & aliud, Diverſity in God*; and yet that *he erected his will, from, or in eternity, (as Mr.* Kendall *tells me), but his power not but in time*; *as if his power lay ſtill whiles his will acted it ſelf, and yet both power and will in him, are himſelf, and ſo but one thing.* Chap. 4. pag. 168.]

1. I obſerve the rare ingenuity of this Antiphiloſopher, that he talks of Gods *erecting his will*; which he would put upon *me* as my phraſe; I beſeech the Reader to peruſe the place, and he ſhall ſee leſſe cauſe to witneſſe for the honeſty of his Pen, then that he had for that of his [*Taylors Mettyard and Sheares.*] I ſpeak there of Gods *exerting*, and *exerciſing* his power in time, not a word of *erecting* his power, or will.

2. A neceſſity of Gods being acknowledged to *exert* his *power only in time*, appears hence, that nothing was made by his power from eternity; yet a neceſſity of acknowledging Gods *willing* from *eternity*, appears hence, that if he did not *will* from *eternity*, to do all that he doth in *time*; he willing it ſince, his will is changed from what it was from eternity; who but ſuch a grave Monſieur, could have had the courage to ſay it?

3. Therefore as facetious as he would ſeem, he puts no abſurdity upon *me*, in ſaying [*I ſpeak as if Gods power lay ſtill whiles his will acted;*] it did ſo I trow, till the *creation*; unleſſe God *exerciſed* his *power*, and yet *made nothing by it*. Sure the man dreams of *Caradock*, whom I have heard a Welch Chronicle reported, to have been *long and long before* Adam.

4. Nor is there any inconſiſtency between [*Gods power lying ſtill,*] as he phraſifies it, [*while Gods will acted, though both power and will in him are himſelf, and ſo but one thing.*] They are but *one thing*, but different *formally* one from the other; ſo doe his *wiſdome* and *mercy*, and *juſtice* differ, yet but *one thing* and *himſelf*. If they *differ not formally*, then what ever may be ſaid of *his mercy*, may be ſaid of *his juſtice*, and *contra*. If they be not *one thing*, then is there a *diverſity of things in God*, and then a *compoſition*; and if a *compoſition* then ſomewhat that is not *abſolutely perfect*; for it is more *perfection* to have *all in one*, then in *diverſe things*. But of this I have diſcourſed at large, and Maſter *Goodwin* himſelf is not my adverſary in it.

If this his ſhadow, will needs have theſe not to be *the ſame thing* with *God himſelf*; then God himſelf may poſſibly be *without theſe*, at leaſt is in order of *nature before*, and ſo in ſuch an *inſtant* as we ſay *without theſe*.

Now I appeal to any intelligent Reader, who ſpeaks moſt honourably of God, *he* or *I*. It ſeemes for want of Logick, he could not finde *that in the Scriptures*, which he confeſſeth Philoſophy teacheth, as well enough he may, even *without* the *Scriptures*.

Sir, right reaſon teacheth us to *attribute* to God *all perfections*, to *abſtract* from him *all imperfections*; and ſuch is *this*, which your godlineſſe would preſume to aſcribe to him.

2. *That both Gods power and will are ſimply one thing in himſelf, yet he exerts his will but once, there can be but one immanent act of God; but his power he may exert very often,*

often, but if both he himself, why may he not erect one as often or seldome as the other?]

(1.) Here the man is in again at his *erecting of Gods will and power*; whether he mean to impose on *me*, or his *Reader*, or *both*, or whether he useth the word as his *own*, I know not; but I am sure he deserves I should *correct* him for this his word *erect*. As much as he doth here *erect his horne*, if a School-boy should talke so, his Master might well take down his *hose*; well, but leaving his *phrase*, consider we his *matter*.

(2.) He abuseth me in pretending I say there is *but one immanent act in God*; yea but I say only there can be *no new immanent act in God*, I acknowledge *many from eternity*; but *all* but the *same really* with *Gods Essence*, yet *formally distinct* from *it*, and *themselves*; we are faine, and we are accordingly allowed, to *apprehend diversely* those things in God, which are *really* the *same*.

(3.) There is ground for our *apprehending several immanent acts*, yet so as to correct our selves, that all are *really one* and the *same* with God; for any *composition* detracts from his *perfection*.

(4) Now there is a clear difference, between the *erecting* (as *he* calls it, *I* say the *exerting*) of his *power*, and the *acting* of his *will*; that *this* must needs be from *eternity*, *that* was not so as before; and he may *change* the actings of his *power*, so as *to act*, and *not act*, the *variation* being all in the *creature*, wherein the *acts of his power* are *terminated*, but he cannot so the *actings* of his *will*, as whereby nothing is *immediately produced* in the Creattures, but they are *terminated ad intra*. And more it will appear that what Mr. *Horne* saith

Lastly, [*Is evidently false that the act or action is all one with the thing acted,*] he should adde *in fieri*, is most *evidently true*. As

Gods creating heaven and earth, is all one with the heaven and the earth *in fieri*, though not *in factis esse*; and so that which he saith, followes not; [*that as the heaven and the earth are yet, so God is still creating them.*] The heavens and the earth are not now *in creating*; but Gods *creating* and *preserving* the heaven and earth are different; yet his *preserving the heaven and the earth*, is really the same with the *heaven and the earth in preservari*.

Now I prove the Creation of the Heaven and Earth, to be the same with the Heaven and Earth *in fieri* thus. If this *Creation* be really different from the Heaven and Earth *in fieri*, then it is either a different *substance*, or *accident*. If a *substance* distinct, then was that *substance created*, or *uncreated*? If *uncreated*, it is God, and so *creation* is *God*, *&c.* If *created*, then by some *other action*, and then there was a *creation* of the *act of creation*. Now then further if this *creation of the act of creation*, were created by an *other act*, then was that *other* act by *another*, and so *in infinitum*.

If an *accident*, then it was in some *subject*; but that must be either *heaven and earth*, or the *Angels*, or *God*, or *nothing*. *Nothing* cannot be the subject of any *accident*; nor *God*; nor the *Angels* the subject of the *action whereby heaven and earth were created*. For then that act must give *denomination* to the Angels, either *actively*, and so *they created heaven and earth*, or *passively*, and then *they were created heaven and earth*.

Lastly, *Heaven and Earth* could not be the subject of this accident, the *creation of heaven and earth*; for the *subject* must be in order of nature before any *accidents* in it; and so accordingly *heaven and earth* were by this rate, *before the creation of heaven and earth*.

The acrters of this Argument, will beat Mr. *Horn* so, that he will have never a bush to hide his head in, but only be faine to draw in his hornes like those of a *snaile*. Well, but let me consider his shewing the absurdity of this assertion of the creation of heaven and earth, being the same with the heaven and the earth *in fieri* by a most Clerk-like simile. [*It is, just* (saith he) *as if I should say, my action of writing, is all one with these lines and letters; and so long as these remaine, my action*

of writing remains also.] As long as these lines and letters remain *in writing*, his action of *writing* remaines also, is all he can make of it, if he will speak pertinently; and so much I hope I may grant him, without affording him any ground of writing any new lines, or letters in opposition to this truth, which is clear enough to any man, whose eyes do not stand in his light.

And thus I have done with his *first* principal head; I come now to the *second*, which lifts up as many hornes, as the beast in the *Revelation* hath, against the necessarinesse of Philosophy to the Preachers of the Gospel; no lesse then *ten*, all which I shall be bold to *tip* in order.

But first, I shall briefly premise this; That Philosophy is not *simply* necessary to the preaching of the Gospel, and the Gospel had been in a fairer case had it never been acquainted with Philosophy; but as things *now* stand, it cannot subsist without it. It puts me in minde of a most ingenuous confession, which I heard from the mouth of the Lord-Keeper *Littleton*, who said, *It had been happy for the Nation, that never any man of his profession had sate in his place in the Chancery; but as things now stood, none but a common Lawyer was capable of managing that businesse.* I say the same of Philosophy in the Pulpit, Happy had it been for the preaching of the Gospel, that Philosophy had never been called in to meddle in it. The truth of the Gospel would have shined clearer, had she been left to *her self*; but since Philosophers have perverted the course by their wranglings, none is so fit to judge of their cavils, and the vanities of them, as Philosophy which now doth better service in that particular, then *Divinity of it self* could do. As a Lawyer, though by his leave, he understand equity no better then many a poor Minister, yet makes a better Chancellor, then a great Bishop; just as the same Lord *Littleton* was pleased to say to me, that Bishop *Williams*'s decrees were the *worst* presidents in that Court, and *Bacons* (he had examined both) the *very best*. And when I asked him why then he called *Bacons wicked times*? he was pleased to give me such an answer (as discovered to me such a mysterie of iniquity, as I had rather conceal, then expresse, but that it is so proper in my present businesse,) *viz.* that there was *no injustice* done by him, but men were faine to pay for *justice*. So say I, even when Philosophy doth *right* to the *Gospel*, the Gospel *payes dear enough* for that *right*; as suffering in *delayes*; and being put off from many advantages, which she had to work on the *affections* of men, by her plaine truthes, whiles she is *righted* against *errours* of *judgement*, which had encroached upon her. And I do not without some sorrow confesse, that I finde in my self, that whiles I am exercising my wits in unravelling some knotty sophismes, I lose not a few of those impressions on my spirit, which I finde by the meditation on a plain promise; which doth more *chear* my heart, as to *my own comfort*, and more *heat* it with zeal to *Gods glory*. Nor do I know any other controversies, besides these about Grace, (in the maintenance whereof it hath pleased God to engage me) that would not have slily bereaved me of much of that sweetnesse, which I have often experienced in the plain application of a precious promise. Thus I have found that I have sometimes written my self sick, whereas I have often preached my self well; and by the liftings up of my spirit, cured the droopings of my body.

It was a good note which I had in a letter at my first coming to a countrey-charge, from a neighbour Minister, borrowing it from *Bernard* upon the *Canticles*; *Suaviora sunt verba quam oscula prædicationis.* Philosophy when she doth best deserve of us in the preaching of the Gospel, makes us pay her too much for her service. This premised, I come now to consider Mr. *Hornes*,

1. Argument against the necessarinesse of it. It runs thus; *If Philosophy, Physicks, Metaphysicks, &c. had been needful for furnishing men to the Gospel, then Christ who came to teach us the minde of God, and to set on foot the preaching of the Gospel, would have delivered those sciences to us, at least a more perfect forme of them, then the Philosophers did, or could. But he did not so, as Mr.* Kendall *sayes, neither he*

nor

nor his Apoſtles read us any Metaphyſical Lectures about the ſimplicity of God, &c. Ergo.]

I anſwer, 1. To the *Major*. As for the *Antecedent* of it,

(1.) I diſtinguiſh of *furniſhing to the Goſpel*, either as to *believe* it; or as to *preach* it. I yield Philopophy is not needfull as to the *firſt*, it is as to the *ſecond*. It is one thing to be furniſhed for a *Diſciple*, another for a *Teacher*. The *ſheep* need not a crook, in their hands, or a tarbox at their girdles, they will not be well though if the *ſhepherd* want either.

(2. I diſtinguiſh of *needfulneſſe*, granting Philoſophy is not *ſimply needful* for the preaching of the Goſpel, when men had *yet* not mixt Philoſophy with it, and corrupted it; but *now* it is. Philoſophy is as Phyſick, not *ſimply needful* for the preſervation of life, (*Adam* in innocence ſhould have had no uſe of it;) but as the caſe ſtood, I think, with *him* after his fall, I am ſure with moſt of *us* ſince it is. So when the Goſpel was in its *purity*, there was no need of Philoſophy; ſince the *depravations* of it there is; that may be *needful now* to the preaching of the Goſpel, which was *not* in Chriſts time. The *knowledge of diverſe tongues*, (which Mr. *Horne* confeſſeth, is at leaſt uſefnl now to the preaching of the Goſpel) was not ſo in *Chriſts time*, when he injoyned his Diſciples to preach to the *loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael*; and they heard not of the *Gentiles* intereſt in their preaching; ſo that let Philoſophy be not *ſimply needful*, yet *now*, *rebus ſic ſtantibus* it is *ſo needful* that no man can do the work of a Preacher *without it*.

2. As to the *conſequence*; though Philoſophy be needful *now*, it followes not *Chriſt would have delivered thoſe ſciences to us then*; he did not give the *gift of tongues* till his *Aſcenſion*, as being not needful *before*, though *after* needfull for the preaching of the Goſpel; Chriſt did not furniſh his Apoſtles with gifts, *till they had need of them*, for *that* piece of work wherein he imployed them. Though *ſcaffolds* be needful for *building*, why ſhould they be raiſed as ſoon as the *foundation* is laid?

2. As to the *Minor*, Chriſt, ſay I, hath delivered a more perfect forme of theſe ſciences, then the Preachers did or could.

Not indeed by directly *teaching rules* of Logick But,

Firſt, by giving *patternes*, or *examples* of inferring, which the meer Philoſophers never did, never will underſtand, witneſſe that *Topick* of concluding *bleſſedneſſe* from being *perſecuted*, *wo* from being *being ſpoken well of by all men*, Matth. 5.

Secondly, by furniſhing the Diſciples, *unlearned men*, with a ſingular and incomparable *faculty of arguing*, which is a *Logical faculty*; and ſo he gave them this *Logica utens*, though they had not that which is called *Logica docens*; but yet ſure they uſed Logick in their *teaching*, drawing ſuch concluſions from Scripture, as all *our* Logick would never have done, had not we learned this Art of inferring, and applying from *them*.

Thirdly, by bringing in *learned men* to imploy their learning in the *defence* of the Goſpel, which was wont to be exerciſed *againſt* it. And thus he did fetch in *Paul*, *Denys*, and many others who all furniſhed the Church with the *Heathens jewels*, and ſerved for her with her *adverſaries armes*.

And how were Learning, and Religion in latter ages, bleſſed with a wonderful Reformation, at one and the ſame time? The lights of the *Church*, were the lights of the *Schooles* too; and whereas Popery held both the Goſpel, and all good Literature in darkneſſe, till *Luther* aroſe; at his ariſing, the darkneſſe was miraculouſly ſcattered from *both* at *once*. So that Chriſt hath not been wanting to his Church in furniſhing her with *theſe ſciences*.

What I pray was the Logick of the old Schools which concluded ſeven *Sacraments* from *five loves*, and *two fiſhes*; The *Popes ſupremacy* from *Ariſe, kill and eat*, the *lawfulneſſe of Images* from *God made man after his own Image*; and (which you would not care to hear) *of* the *burning of Hereticks* from *Hereticum de vita*, almoſt as

learnedly as the *French* Lawyer did the Salique Law, whereby the Crown of *France is* intailed to the Heirs Male, from this, that the *Lilies neither sowe nor spin*? The world must know, that it owes the Reformation of Logick to the *Protestant Doctors*; who had they been but such Disputants, as had no better Logick then our *new Predicants*, who speak against it as needlesse, they might have tugged long enough, ere they had untwisted any piece of that *net*, wherein *Peters* pretended successor, that crafty fisher of men, had unhappily incloſed almost all the soules in the world. And sure since *Learning* hath been decried as *needlesse to the Preaching of the Gospel*, he hath had a notable fishing trade upon our *land*, and done us more mischief then all the Herring-Busses about *Scarborow*; and we accordingly have reason to call him to an account for it, and hope one day to make him give up his *Court* of *Inquisition*, which is the least we can demand for *our satisfaction*.

This were to propagate the Gospel, instead of crying down learning at home, to require our adversaries, (as we may both justly and easily do) to give up that cursed Court of the Inquisition; which if it were but once down, the poor soules in *Spaine*, and elsewhere, would soon learne Logick enough to confute or dispute down the Pope and his Cardinals, and pluck out Antichrist by the eares.

Shortly then, hitherto your first Argument hath not proved Philosophy, which acknowledgeth Logick the principall part of it, to be *needlesse for the preaching of the Gospel*, for that Christ hath not delivered it to us. *We* have shewed he hath, and I pray whence have *you* your learning, whereby you dispute against Learning if not from *Christ*, whom we professe to owe for *all our gifts*, though in a *different way*? it seemes you had it from *Antichrist*. sure in his service you do most faithfully imploy it.

I come to your second Argument, which runs thus,

[If they had been necessary as above, then would Christ have chosen the wise, and prudent Scribes and Pharisees, Philosophers, and Princes of the world for knowledge in such sciences, to have been Gospel-Preachers; or else have furnished those he did chuse, with knowledge in them. But he did neither; not the *first*, Matth. 11. 25, 26. 1 Cor. 1. 26. not the *second*, for he only gave them *his Spirit*, to open to them the mysteties of salvation contained in the Scriptures. *Ergo.*]

I answer,

1. Your *Major* is subject to the same exceptions that its fellow was in your precedent Argument, and hath been a little examined already.

2. So hath your *Minor*; yet I shall adde this, Christ did from heaven call one *Paul* a Pharisee that did more service, then all the Disciples he chose while he was on earth; *Paul* was of such abilities in learning, that as Dr. *Twisse* said once of him at a visitation in a slie bluntnesse he thought, if *Paul* would have taken that way, he might have been as great a man as the Archbishop of *Canterbury*. Now this *Paul*, who was furnisht to his hand, did Christ especially imploy in *writing*, which was the *main work* for the *propagating of the Gospel*. And for all the rest of the Disciples, he furnished them with such a Logical faculty, as that the best Philosophers of the Heathens, were all dunces to them. But

Say you, [*He only gave them his Spirit to open the mysteries of salvation contained in the Scriptures*;] true,

But first, did not that *Spirit* breath in them more Logically, then your pen, or mine runs? They needed none to teach them Logick, when once they had this *Spirit* for their Tutor.

Secondly, did they *open the mysteries of salvation, contained in the Scriptures*, without a Key? And did not that *Key* turne in the *Wards* of Logick? They indeed opened not mysteries of Physicks, Metaphysicks, &c. but they opened those mysteries of salvation, so as they did not crosse any principles or truthes of Physick, Metaphysicks. Yea the mysteries of salvation, cannot be opened without [that knowledge of Philosophy, Metaphysicks, &c. which our adversaries do grudge us.

For

For instance, first for Physicks, The Scriptures tell us, *The heavens must containe Christ till the Restitution of all things.* This cannot stand with Christs *body* being upon the *Communion Table*, here the Apostle opened not this truth, *that a body is but in one place*; but *we* cannot open the *Apostles words*, unlesse we say. 1. That Christs body is contained in heaven as *its place*. And, 2. Therefore it is in the Sacrament only as *its signe*. The Apostle opened to us this piece of Learning, that *the thing signified may be predicated of the signe*. *The Rock was Christ*, just as the *bread* in the Sacrament is *Christs body*. Take away the Physicks, and you may tell us as the Papists do, *a body may be in divers places at once*. This is false, and therefore that those words in the Scripture may be truly opened; we have need both of Physicks, and Logick; of Physicks to shew us the truth of *this*, that *the heavens containe Christs body*, without being prejudiced by the words, *This is my body*; and of Logick, to shew us the truth of these words, *This is my body*, without any impeachment of them by those, *The heavens must contain Christ till the restitution of all things.*

Secondly, for the Metaphysicks, the Scriptures tell us *God is immortal*, this cannot stand with *Gods dying*; here the Apostle opened not this truth; that *God is immortal* by any Metaphysical demonstration; but *we* cannot open these words of the Scriptures, unlesse we say. 1. That God as *God* is immortal; and therefore God did die as being *man*; and that the second Person taking the nature of man, whatsoever befell the *manhood* which he took, may be predicated of the *person* which took it. The Apostle opened to us this piece of learning, that *whatsoever is predicated of the part of a person, may be predicated of the person in respect of that part.* Take away the Metaphysicks, and you may tell us, as some old monsters did, that the *Godhead is corruptible.*

This is false; and therefore that those words in the Scripture may be truly opened, we have need both of Metaphysicks, and Logick; of Metaphysicks, to shew us the truth of this, that *God is immortal*, without being prejudiced by those words, *God purchased his Church with his own blood*; of Logick, to shew us the truth of those words, *God purchased his Church with his own blood*, without any impeachment of them by those, *God is immortal.*

I ask you now, whether the Apostles would not have opened these Scriptures, as you I am sure would do? if you say *no*, then you do not open them according to the Apostles minde; if *yea*, then the Apostles had used Metaphysicks and Logick, as well as *you*. And I am confident they had a great deal more of both, then either *you*, or *I*. If you conclude, *they were not furnished with skill in these pieces of Philosophy, because they did not read the writings of Philosophers*; you may upon the same ground inferre, *that Christ had none neither*; for I am confident, you will not say, he *ever read* Aristotle, *or* Plato, *or any of the other Philosophers among the Greeks, or Jewes either*; and yet it was the wonder of their *Rabbies*, that Christ knew so much, I trow in all sciences, though he *never learned* any; or you may say that *Adam was ignorant of them, because* of my conscience, he never turned over as much as one leaf of all those Volumes.

Your third Argument, is,

[*They, that is, Philosophy, Physicks, Metaphysicks, &c. are of diverse nature from the Gospel, that being a Revelation of a Redemption, and way to salvation for fallen man; Philosophy but a purblinde speculation about the nature of creatures, their qualities, and conditions as creatures; and of God, as he stands in the relation of a Creator, or Governour to them; and therefore can be no more necessary to the understanding of the preaching of the Gospel in its simplicity, then a candle light to shew the Sun.*] I answer,

1. That we are now speaking of understanding *how to preach the Gospel*, not of understanding *the preaching of the Gospel*, i. e. the *Gospel preached*; and so your conclusion, if yielded, falls short of your designe, to prove *Philosophy unnecessary for the preaching of the Gospel*, though I yield you, it is *unnecessary for the hearers of the Gospel.*

2. Yet

2. Yet will I not ſo whiffle off your Argument, but conſider it in mood and figure, and then it runs thus.

That which is of a diverſe nature from the Goſpel, is unneceſſary to the preaching of it. But Philoſophy is of a diverſe nature from the Goſpel. Ergo.

1. If your *Major* were ſtrong enough, he would put you to many terrible ſtraits, and make you renounce *your reaſon as neceſſary to the preaching of the Goſpel.* For, *your Reaſon* is of *a diverſe nature from the Goſpel* Now how well you either uſe, or are unable to preach without *your reaſon*, you have reaſon to know better then I. But,

2. Your *Minor*, but that the beſt is, it is too weak, would ſtrike off all the firſt Chapter of the Bible, as *unneceſſary for the preaching of the Goſpel*, as *containing a deſcription of the nature of creatures, their qualities and conditions; and of God as he ſtands in the relation of a Creator, or Governour to them*; ſo that it would wipe off one *Chapter* at leaſt of *Moſes*, as well as *all the Books* of the Phyſicks, and Metaphyſicks; Nay, and it would fetch off many a Chapter out of *Geneſis* beſides, which *containes things of a farre different nature from the Redemption, and way of ſalvation for fallen men.* What think you of Chap. 5. where you have only a Genealogy? which ſure doth not much edifie the *hearer*, and ſometimes not a little trouble the *Reader*; witneſſe him, who to make ſhort work of it, ſaid, ſo they begot one another to the end of the Ch.

3. Therefore you may pleaſe to know, that *ſome things of a different nature from Redemption, and the way of ſalvation of fallen man*, are yet *neceſſary to the preaching of this Redemption*; yea, all as neceſſary as *ſome parts* of Philoſophy are to the teaching of *others*, which are of a *different nature from them*; as for inſtance, Logick is to the teaching of the Phyſicks, and all other ſciences, as which is the *Meteyard* by which you muſt meaſure out all concluſions; And Metaphyſicks to all other ſciences, though of a farre *different nature*, as which as the Maſter of the Shop, *outs out the work* for all other diſciplines; and as it were, delivers every one of them its proper *taske* in its Categories.

4. By your good leave, there is an abſolute neceſſity of the knowledge *of the nature of the creature and of God as he ſtands in the relation of a Creator, and Governour to it*, to the preaching of the Goſpel. For how I pray ſhall we know how man lies under the wrath of God and is in ſo much danger of deſtruction, becauſe of this wrath, if we know not the *relation of the creature to God*, ſuch as to be under his juſt diſpoſal upon every ſin; and the relation of God to the creature, ſo as to be able in juſtice, to inflict whatever puniſhment he pleaſeth on his diſobedient creatures? how that man is liable to eternall miſery, capable of eternal glory, unleſſe we know the ſoul of man to be immortal? The Goſpel (my good friend) *ſuppoſeth* the knowledge of this, doth not *inſtruct* us in it, as altogether *ignorant* of it before. So then this *difference* of the *nature of Philoſophy* from that of the *Goſpel*, proves it not *unneceſſary to the preaching of the Goſpel.* This Argument gives ſuch light to your buſineſſe, that any man may ſee the Lanthorne where it is put, hath a very *thick horne*, and as *thin a candle* in it.

Philoſophy, I yield you, is in compariſon of the Goſpel, but *as a candle to the Sun*, but even when the *Sun* is in his Meridian height, a *candle* may be *neceſſary* to ſhew us ſome things, which the *Sun* doth not vouchſafe to look directly upon, in a *blinde chink*. I do not think it was in the *night* that the good woman lighted her *candle*, to ſeek her *loſt groat*, which is worth more then many paperfulls of theſe your profound Argumentations.

I proceed to your fourth Argument. [*The Law, or Doctrine of the Lord is perfect both for converting ſouls to God, and building up the converted to the inheritance*, Pſal. 19. 7. Acts 26. 32. *Which is the whole buſineſſe of the Goſpel-Miniſtery.* Therefore *there is no need of Philoſophical ſciences, which are but the obſervations of a purblinde minde*; and the inferences and deductions, of a corrupted perverted Reaſon]

I answer,

1. By Concession. That the Law is indeed *a perfect rule for conversation*, but that the Law may be used to this purpose, there is necessarily required Logick in the application of it, and the answering objections made, even against the *perfection* of this LAW.

How have the Papists abused their wits, in opposing the *perfection* of the *Scriptures*, as if they needed to be eked out with unwritten traditions; yea, in charging the *Scriptures* with a pestilential influence on ordinary Readers, so as they may not be safely communicated to them in the vulgar languages? to speak nothing of their denying the *authority* of the *Scriptures*, save what they borrow from the *Church*; belike you will answer *Bellarmine* without Logick, in a down-right *mentiris*. Nay, how have many among *us*, vilified the *Scriptures* as fables, both false, and foolish? It may be you will confute all *Antiscripturists*, without knowing the *Art of arguing*. The Scriptures are in all humility acknowledged *perfect to convince* souls, and *confute* seducers, as furnishing us with *materials* for *both*; but there is a necessity of Logick for the *managing* of these materials, just as the Law of the Nation, though never so *perfect* for the *stating* of *controversies* about mens titles; yet needs Logick in the *Judges*, who if they have not that part of Logick which is called *judicium*, will be fearfully misled by the *pleaders inventions*.

The *Scriptures* are the *Quarrie*, whence we have all our *stones* for this *building* you speak of; but we do not use to have *stones* out of a *quarry* without *digging*; nor do we digge *pickaxes* and *lines* and *plummets* out of the *quarry*, but I conceive we are wont to go to the *Shops* for them. If you can build but an *Oven* with all the *stones* in a *quarry*, without these *instruments*; I confesse you may build up *faults* without Logick; by the bare words of the *Scripture*. It is true, you may make a shift to *heap* up stones for a *hedge*, without being beholding to a *line*; but if you ever make a good *wall*, you shall have my leave to set your *head* on the top of it, in as much state as ever any stood upon *London*-Bridge.

But I pray, is *building up* all the work of a Minister? I conceive, be it spoken without offence, that plucking up is sometimes as necessary to edifying; you must *digge* the *earth* ere you *lay* the *foundation*, and how you will do this without *tooles*, over and above your *stones*, is more then my weakness presumes to understand. I have heard indeed of some that have *digged* their *graves* with their *teeth*, and others that have *cut* their *throats* with their *tongues*; but you are the first that ever undertook to digge the *foundation* of an *house* with your *bare nailes*, for I suppose you will not stoop so low as to imploy your nose in such a work. We are wont in my countrey to tell children, that if they *pisse* down the *wall*, they shall *build* it up with the same *toole*.

Certainly if you build a *wall*, though you have never so good materials, without *tooles*, any adversary may *pisse* it down, though he be not so well stored in his bladder, as he who feared, lest if he made water, he should drowne the City. And so much shall serve for your Argument from *building*, by which we may see what a *Master-builder* you are; who certainly can build *Castles in the aire*, without *tooles*, and are the very *Inigo* at such works.

Yet before I passe to your next Argument, I think fit to observe your worthy observation; that *Philosophy is but the observations of a purblinde minde, the deductions of a corrupted perverted Reason.* Be it so, yet not presently *corrupted and perverted deductions*, though of a *corrupted perverted reason*; no more then the *colt of a lame mare*, must needs be the *lame colt of a mare*, or the *Egge of a gagling Goose*, must needs be the *gagling egge of a Goose*, or *the Goose of a pressing pen*, whereof you speak in this Digression, were a *pressing Goose of wit*. Next follows your

5th. Argument, [If the heathenish or humane sciences be necessary, as before, then we are not compleat in Christ; nor are all the treasures of wisdome, and knowledge, necessary for our salvation, and the carrying on of his work, hid or

couched in him, and his myſtery; but the contrary is affirmed, *Col.* 2. 2, 3, 10. Ergo.]

I anſwer, 1. To your *Major*. The Antecedent in vain eſſayes to ſlurre theſe ſciences, as *heatheniſh*, to bring them upon that account to be *unneceſſary*.

For firſt, if by *heatheniſh*, you mean ſuch as are *found among heathens*; you may as well caſt off Reaſon, as unneceſſary to the preaching of the Goſpel, for that I trow was found among the Heathens, (unleſs you think *Ariſtotle*, *Plato* and others had no reaſon which would ſhew how great a portion of reaſon is fallen to your ſhare;) but I think it was nothing the more *Heatheniſh* for this; If by *Heatheniſh* you mean ſuch as were *found out by Heathens*, You forget our old father *Adam*, (to mention no others) who was I dare ſay much more ſcientifical as ſome uſe to ſpeak, then your Worſhip or mine. So then theſe ſciences are not *Heatheniſh* in this ſenſe, and cannot with any ſenſe be ſaid to be *Heatheniſh* in the *other* reſpect; or if they were, that *heatheniſhneſs* renders them not *unneceſſary* to the preaching of the Goſpel. I wonder what you think of the Heathen Greek, whether that be not as neceſſary to the preaching of the Goſpel, as the Hebrew. You confeſſe ſome uſefulneſſe of the tongues in the cloſe of your Digreſſion; ſome would think of the two, this *heathen Greek* were more neceſſary then the *Holy Hebrew*; the *Old* Teſtament onely being written in *that*, the *New* in *this*. Well,

Secondly, for the *conſequence*; Though thoſe *Heatheniſh ſciences* be ſaid to be neceſſary for the preaching of the Goſpel, it followes not that *We are not compleat in Chriſt, or that all the treaſures of wiſdome are not hid and couched in his Myſtery*; all the *materials* of our preaching are there, but ſure not all the *neceſſary requiſitions* to our unfolding of them; witneſſe the Art of *Reading* and *Writing*, which I hope *you* hold neceſſary to our preaching of the Goſpel, yet you never put any man to Chriſt to Schoole for them; Nay, though your Clerk may teach theſe in the *Belfrey*, yet your Doctorſhip, I wis is not at leaſure to do it in the *Pulpit*. Chriſt (man as witty as you think are in your following note,) needs not theſe to *compleat him*; *We* need them to *compleat us* for the teaching of him, and his Myſtery.

Let us hear what you have to ſay to the contrary in your 6th. Argument. [If we are to beware of Philoſophy, leſt we be ſpoiled by it, then is it not neceſſary to teach and preſerve us. But the former is true; *Ergo*.]

I anſwer to your *Major*, that it had talked as wiſely, had it ſaid thus; If we are to beware of our meat, leſt we ſurfeit on it, then is it not neceſſary to feed us; or if we are to beware of our drink, leſt we be intoxicated by it, *Ergo* it is not neceſſary for the concoction of our meat.

If this be good arguing, you may not only excuſe *Lycurgus*, for cutting down all the Vines in his Countrey; but condemne our late Parliament-men, for that inſtead of putting an *Exciſe upon drink*, they had not forbidden *Brewing*, by which one act they had immediately rooted out all the CAVALIERS, who doubtleſſe would have fled the Countrey upon it; and have preferred the worſt Ale-houſe in Dutchland, before the beſt ſeat in *England*: Nor do I think that *your ſelf*, had there been *no drink* going, would have had the courage to adventure on ſuch a *dry piece of work as this* for your good friend Mr. *Goodwin*, I know not for what *wages*; but ſure you have reaſon to have ſo much as to make you *drink* for your paines.

Sir, when the Apoſtle bids us beware of Philoſophy, 1. He means of *abuſing* it, or being *abuſed* by it; *he* doth not condemne Philoſophy as dangerous in it *ſelf*, nor have *you* reaſon to ſleight it as *unneceſſary*.

2. He intends Philoſophy *ſo eſteemed*, nor *really ſuch*. He bids them beware perhaps of *Plato's* Philoſophy, doth it follow of Philoſophy in general? As well you may ſay, that if I bid men beware of Mr. *Hornes*, or Mr. *Goodwins* Divinity, I bid them beware of Divinity in generall; and eſchew that of *Calvin*, or the Synod of *Dort*, or *Weſtminſter*; or if I bid them beware of the Mechanical mens preaching, I bid them beware of preaching, or of hearing the Sermons at *Pauls*, or *Gregories*, be-

cauſe

cause I bid them beware of the Sermons in the new Church adjoyning. But you gravely adde,

[Nor may we think that the Apostle calls such Sophistry only by that name, as the wisest Philosophers called Sophistry, and not Philosophy; but that which those wisest Philosophers called, and acounted Philosophy.]

Right; but the wisest of those Philosophers called *that* Philosophy, and more, which was nothing lesse, *professing themselves to be wise, they became fooles*; and the *highest pieces* of Philosophy in their esteeme, were *vain imaginations*; the *lower pieces* notwithstanding, were of *high use*; as for instance, those Doctrines of Mr. *Goodwins*, which he lookes on as the *choicest*, because of their lying out of the rode, wherein the Rut of reformed Divines run, are indeed the *worst of his Doctrines*, and worth just nothing; yet those Doctrines of his, which he esteemes more *low* and *common*, are of singular *worth*, witnesse his Book of *God a good Master*, &c. and had his high parts been content to flie but at that pitch, he had been a most excellent servant to God and his Church. Advance we now to your

7th. Argument, [The Apostle implies, that the setting up such wisdome in the Church of God, is to defile the temple of God, 1 Cor. 3. 16, 17, 18. diligently compared, which is all one as to say to exalt it as needful, and necessary to the work of Christ, is to make it an Idol, it being but part of the *name of a man* which is upon the *Beast*; Ergo.]

I answer, to say it is *needful*, is far from *exalting* it, or making an *idol of it*; do you presently *exalt* that which you hold *needful*? belike then you exalt your close-stoole, which is sometimes as needful as a *hat* upon your head. This is an Argument, lookes like St. *Francis* his Preaching, when he wore his *breeches* on his *crowne*.

Do you make an idol of that which you hold *needful*? then *you* make an idol of *Bread* as well as the *Papists*. I pray bethink your self, those things which are *most needful*, are *least exalted*. The Grammar-School is more needful then the University; I speak it I am sure without the offence of any of the Students, who will not say, I therefore exalt the *Schoole* at *Winchester* above *New Colledge* at *Oxford*, or the *Schoole* at *Eaton* above *Kings Colledge* in *Cambridge*; I may truly say, *Water* is more *needful* then *wine*, do I therefore exalt a *tankard* of *Tiffe* above a *pottle* of Claret? once more, *Tyburne* is much more needful then the *Dancing-Schoole*, the Master of this Schoole would think himself lamentably *exalted*, if he were called to shew his skill in *dancing in a rope at* Tyburne.

What trash is this to come from a man, that *exalts* himself above Mr. *Goodwin*, and presumes to advise him to let go his *Metaphysical weapons*, and learn of him to shew better trickes with a *staffe*? Well, this is a *necessary man* though, and accordingly I will *exalt him so farre* as to leave him to imploy himself, in a *house* more *necessary* then his *study*.

As for the needfulnesse of Philosophy as presented by us, it drawes not after it such a glorious traine, as *exaltation*, or *idolizing*, no more then our saying a *Horne-book* is *necessary*, which sure cannot be said of many worthyer Works then this of my learned Gentleman, is such an *exalting* a *Horne-book*, as to commit *Idolatry* with it. The setting up of Philosophy in the preaching of the Gospel, is not an *exalting* of it above the Gospel, more then the setting up a Writing-Schoole under a *Grammar-Schoole*, as was done at *Exeter*, was an *exalting* of *that* above *this*. Philosophy (I confesse) is never more honourably *exalted*, then when imployed in the *meanest services* about Divinity; but the imploying her in the *service* of Divinity is no *exalting* her *above Divinity*, let the Philosopher ride *before* Divinity as much as he will, as long as he *rides* but in the quality of a *servant*, being ready to alight at any turne at the *command* of the Divine, and to *wait* as becomes him upon his *stirrop*. Now for

Your 8th. Argument, [If the coming with the Gospel in such a Philosophical way,

that is, holding it forth with, and in the exercise of Words and Arguments, after the manner of the wise Philosophers of the World, be the way to obscure the power and Crosse of Christ, then is it not necessary to be furnished therewith for the preaching of the Gospel, &c? But the Premisses are held forth by *Paul*; Ergo.]

I answer, 1. To your Major. 1. The Antecedent should have done well to consider, that *all the work of preaching* is not to *hold forth the truth*; there is a necessary part, called *beating back Error*. Now we do not speak of *holding forth the Gospel by Philosophy*, which we do not think *absolutely necessary* to this *holding forth*, but of the *beating back Errours*; without which *beating back*, no *holding forth* is like to *hold* long.

2. We may hold Philosophy *necessary in holding forth the truth*; yet hold withall, that the truth may be *so held forth*, as to be *prejudiced* by it; just as we *necessarily* use our *tongues* in *speaking*; yet may so *speak* with our *tongues*, that we had better have *held our peace*.

2. To your Minor, *Paul* condemnes such a vain holding forth the truth, where men study the Philosophical *holding forth* more then the *truth*, and make such Sermons, as King *James* sometimes compared to a field, where the fine red and yellow flowers, devoured all the corne; or as my old Schoole-Master did a jingling exercise to a *fooles coat*, where the *lace* did so gloriously vaunt it self, that the *cloath* (as if it had been dashed out of countenance) durst not peep out so as to be seen. I professe as much against this vaine kinde of preaching, as any man; and I must needs confesse, I sit upon *thornes* when I hear nothing but *flowers* in the Pulpit; which is seldome so *decked* but by some *light sorry* fellowes, who were never guilty of Philosophy; and think to get the applause of wits among the *vulgar sort*, for a kinde of *Schoole-boy* Orations, (as I may call them) which would be hissed at a *deske* in a Colledge; I think such as *Perkins*, *Dod*, and *Dent*, were far truer Orators, then all the Postillers in Christendome; and am bold to say, he is but a foole that thinks otherwise. Their Antitheta *here*, and *there*, *now*, and *then*, &c. their *turning* and returning of words put me in minde of what I heard not long since, much after the tune. A *pie* and a *pudding*, a *pudding* and a *pie*, a *pudding-pie*, a *pie* for *me*, a *pudding* for *thee*, a *pudding* for *me*, and a *pie* for *thee*, a *pudding-pie for thee and me*, the descanting upon the words of Text, much after this rate is as rare musicke in a Country-Church, as was ever made in a Cathedral by Organs without Bellowes. I may be bold to say, no man ever heard a man that was looked upon as a *Philosopher* in the University, turne such a *player* in the Church. It is this effeminate kinde of preaching, that the Apostle seemes to condemne, not for its *Arguments*, as you speak, but its *Arte lesse affectation of sound*, rather then *sense*.

I have done with this Argument, as soon as I have added this, that whereas you joyne this *wordy wisdome* and *Metaphysicks together*, few men whose braine serves them for the *Metaphysicks*, were ever guilty of this *pedantical Rhetorication*. They are *emptier* understandings that make such a full noise.

Your 9th. Argument is this, [*Paul* in his Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, giving instructions for the choice of Bishops, speaks nothing of their Philosophy; *Ergo* he required it not as necessary to preaching the Gospel.]

I answer,

1. You may as well say, the Church of *England* never thought *reading necessary* to *preaching*, because she never mention'd *this* in any of her Canons about the *qualification of Preachers*. Alas, Sir, some things are so *necessary* to this work, that it is in *vaine* to speak of them as *requisite*. I am bold to say, No Church in latter times would have admitted any man to be a Bishop, that could not *legere Grammaticaliter*; and yet there was never but one old Caveat, put in against such ignorant *intruders* into that *great place*. But,

2. *Paul*

9. *Pauls* requiring that a Bishop be *apt to teach*, and *able to stop the mouth of the gainsayers*, implies he should have *that part of Philosophy* which is called *rational*, I mean *Logick*, without which he would but *answer* Arguments, at the rate that you *make* them, so necessary is this part for *confuting adversaries*, though it be not altogether so necessary for *converting of souls*. And it is worth the observing, that as for *miracles*, though many were done for *converting Pagans*, we read of few or none done for *confuting Hereticks*. This work was done by rationall Argumentation, not by supernatural alterations of the course of nature.

Your 10th. Argument falls in with your 6th. and is but the *same* for the *stuffe*, though in *another dresse*, drawn from the *sufficiency of the Scriptures to furnish the man of God to all the work of a Minister*. Which is granted, as furnishing him with *matter*; it is below the Scripture to indoctrinate him in *moods and figures*, wherein they are to be tall. Many rare *patternes* of these we have in Scripture, *rules* we have none. And thus have I so bowed these ten Hornes, wherewith you endeavour to goare Philosophy as unnecessary to Preachers of the Gospel, that you may be allowed to butte with them as much as you think good, for any harme you will do by it; only while you *play with me* somewhat innocently, you have dangerously *wounded* Mr. *Goodwine*, whom you pretended to *defend*. He it was that led me to make so much use of my little Philosophy, nor did I take up my Metaphysical Mere-yard, as you word it, to measure out Gods Nature and Essence, the manner of his knowing, willing, acting, but to exmine how well Mr. *Goodwin* had performed his part in this worthy Work; and to shew that his Reason, (as large a measure as he hath above most other men.) did most unreasonably presume in her undertaking this way, and at once went farre above her own line, and fell infinitely short in calculating the incomprehensible excellencies, and measuring the unconceivable wayes of God, which challenge our *humble adoration*, forbid our *curious Inquisition*.

For conclusion of all, be pleased good Mr. *Horne*, to take notice, how well you have deserved (by your dispute against Philosophical sciences, as unnecessary to the preachers of the Gospel in their great Work,) to be cashiered out of the company of those *Preachers*, that make use of these sciences, and those *Students* which spend their time in preparing themselves by these sciences, for the better *preaching of the Gospel*; yet unlesse you think good to cashier your self, I will not perswade any of the Officers of these Regiments, to call you out by a *sentence*, proportionable to your *merit*; but it shall suffice, that you be content to runne the *Gantlop*, and submit your self to the mercy of every *Scholar*, who (I suppose) will give you onely a *gentle lash*; which though my old Schoole-Master was wont to say it break no *bones*, yet will be enough to break the *Hornes* which you set so high, and teach you not to speak so presumptuously with a *stiffe neck*. And so I bid you farewell, hoping I shall not have cause to salute you again, till I may addresse my selfe to you, with the stile of *Count Horne*, as who deserve as *well* of the Martiall Predicants, as *ill* of the UNIVERSITY-STUDENTS; and have put *your selfe* into a faire capacity, of as much *honour among* the *Sword-men*, as you have drawn a *just odium* upon your self among all *Governors*.

But I hope they will consider the edge of their *wits*, hath no reason to compare with that of their *Weapons*, and they are like to do as *little good* by their *Preachings*, as you will do *harme* by your *writing*, and so *finally* after *Lastly*, I bid you and them once again farwel.

Having said so much in answer to this Digressor, I shall need say the lesse to Master *Baxter*; a man against whom I am unwilling to say any thing at all; It sufficeth me to correct that part of his Book, which hath stricken at Philosophy, (whiles he himself meddles too much with it) upon the back of Master *Hornes*; So *young Princes* use to be whipped in a *Prayer*; by the

ſame token, King *Edward* the 6th. in his childe-hood, adventured to knight a young Gentleman, that was wont to be beaten for his faults, as a *Spaniel* for thoſe of a *Lion*, and gravely told his Father, who queſtioned him for this his preſumption, that the Boy had valiantly received more ſcarres in his ſervice, then moſt of the Knights which his Majeſty had Dubbed had done in *His*.

I Shall adde for a cloſe of all, that thoſe *lines* which I have *written* in anſwer to Maſter *Horne*, may indifferently well ſerve for a *clue* to lead the Reader thorow Maſter *Biddles* late *Miſmaſe*, wherein he hath *laſt himſelf*, and may *hazard* many an *inconſiderate ſoul* upon a conceit of *ſuch a ſufficiency* in the Scriptures to make the ſimple, not only wiſe to ſalvation, but thorowly furniſhed as men of God to every good work in that Sphere, altogether excluding all uſe of Logick. Had he had *that Logick*, that his *Standing* in the Univerſity would ſeem to beſpeak in him, he had not concluded,

1. That *God is in a certaine place*, and ſo *not in every place*, becauſe *in heaven*: the Pſalmiſt ſaith, as *If I go up into heaven, thou art there*; ſo, *If I go down into hell, thou art there alſo*, Pſalm 139. and *Solomon*, *Behold the heaven, and the heaven of heavens cannot containe thee*, 2 Chron. 6. 18.

Nor, 2. That *there are paſſions in God, becauſe Repentance is aſcribed to him*; *Moſes* ſaith, *God is not as man that he ſhould repent*, Numbers 23. 19.

Nor, 3. That *God hath a ſhape*, becauſe God ſaith, *Let us make man after our Image*; God ſaith again, he is *a Spirit*, John 4. and that can have *no ſhape*, unleſſe Maſter *Biddles ſoule* may have one, which ſure muſt be a very *ſtrange one*. And how *miſſhapen* is his *inference*, that *God hath a ſhape, becauſe Chriſt ſaith, ye have not ſeen his ſhape*? John 5. 37. which is as good, as if I ſhould be ſaid to imply, there *were good Logick* in that *Catechiſme* of Maſter *Biddles*, in caſe I ſaid, *no man hath ſeen it there*.

Nor, 4. That *God doth not know free actions till they come to paſſe*, becauſe *he brought every beaſt to* Adam *to ſee what he would call them*; *Known unto God*, ſaith the Pſamiſt, *are all our thoughts*, and ſure much our *actions a farre off*, Pſal. 139. or elſe he was too forward to foretell ſo many of them.

Nor, 5. *That Chriſt is not truely God, becauſe he is ſtiled a man*; the Scriptures frequently calls him *God too*, *Who is over all, God bleſſed for ever*, Rom. 9. 5.

Nor, 6. That *Chriſt was not God from all Eternity*, becauſe the Father ſaith, *when he raiſed the dead, This day have I begotten thee*; He ſaid to the ſame purpoſe, when Chriſt was *Baptized*, when he was *transfigured*.

Nor, 7. That *Chriſt raiſed not up himſelf from the dead*, becauſe *God is ſaid to have raiſed him up*; the Scripture ſaith more then once, *He himſelf is God*: In ſhort, theſe Monſters of Blaſphemies, *cum multis aliis*, againſt the *infiniteneſſe* and *incomprehenſibleneſſe* of God, &c. have no other way to ſet up *themſelves*, but by crying down Logick; and as for the good ſervice they do to Chriſt and his Church, that admit them to the *Pulpit*, who preach down the *Schooles*, We have already ſeen ſo much of it, as may make us poor men *weep*, and ſome greater men *bluſh*. *Why do the Heathen rage, and the people imagine a vaine thing? Be wiſe now therefore, O ye Kings, be inſtructed ye that are Judges of the earth; ſerve the Lord with feare, and rejoyce with trembling; Kiſſe the Sonne, leſt he be angry, and ye periſh from the Way; if his wrath be kindled, yea, but a little. Bleſſed are all they that put their truſt in him.*

Surely, Logick (however a late Examiner of the Univerſities pleas'd to call *Reaſon the ſpawn of the old Serpent*,) is that, which if it be baniſhed the *Pulpit*, the *Old Serpent* will ſoon paſſe for *a Dove*; and having deprived God of the glory of his

infinite-

infinitenesse, incomprehensibility, omniscience, omnipresence, and the rest of his *Divine excellencies*, as he hath endeavoured to do in that *Catechisme* will quickly attempt somewhat against the delegated authority of the *Magistrate*, nor can the *Magistrate* expect *God should uphold his power*, if the *Magistrate* be contented to wink at the denial of *Gods power*.

No *treason* may presume to compare with *Blasphemy*, Now the Lord make the great men on earth jealous how they suffer *his Name* to be *profained*, who alone can *protect them*, and hath said; *He will honour those that honour him*, that *they that despise him shall be lightly esteemed*. God keep us all from *Satan, transforming himself into an Angel of light*.

Psal. 2. 4. *He that sits in heaven shall laugh, the Lord shall have them in derision.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

CHAP. I. Pag. 4. l. 22. *his* read *its*, p. 8. l. 4, del. *no*, p. 9. l. *ult nurture*, r. *mixture*, l. 49. *is*, r. *as* p. 10. *for her twice*, r. *its*, p. 20. r. *quæ*, p. 14. l. 18. r. *recovers*, p. 16. 35. r. *whence*, p. 40. l. 29. *it*, r. *ours*. p. 42. l. 3. del. *Luther*, p. 49. l. 3. r. *seeme*, l. 18. *in*, r. *on*,

CHAP. II. Pag. 50. l. 32. del. *was not be*. p. 63. l. 20. *for*, r. *Sir*, l. 40. *as*, r. *his*, p. 64. l. 29. r. *can hope to give*, p. 66. l. 34. *be If.* r. *are not of*, p. 73. l. 15. del. *nor*, l. 28. d. *in*, *to*, r. *yeelds*, p. 74. l. 36. del. *as* p. 75. l. 7. *uls*, r. *penc*, p. 82. r. *reflexionis*, p. 88. l. 17. r. *last*, l. 24. r. *them*, p. 92. l. 16. *to*, r. *in*, p. 104. l. 16. r. *of all things*, l. 44. adde *of means as being it self*, p. 119. l. 39. *resisting*, r. *irresistible*, p, 120. transp. *And certainly, &c. after* 2. *No considerable benefit by it*, p. 128. l. 12. r. *even now*, l. 42. adde, *or to permit so, as it shall come to passe*.

CHAP. III. Pag. 4. r. *they are not all Israel that are of Israel*, p. 10. l. 42. *of*. r. *to*, p. 17. *perdant*, p. 25. l. 5. r. *do only*, p. 30. l. 42. del. *as*, p. 45. l. 34. r. *your*, p. 46. *idem*, p. 50. l. 44. r. *are all*, p. 64. l. 29. r. *asserting*, p. 64. l. 30. *As*, r. *his*, p. 67. l. 23. del. *not*, *add*, l. 6. p. 70 l. 10. del. *be*. l. 33. r. *she scornes*.

CHAP. IV. Pag. 74. l. 4. r. *respit*, p. 78. l. 34. del. *next*, p. 88. l. 34. *whether*, r. *that*, p 92. l. 11. adde *and especial*, p. 96. l. 19. adde *notwithstanding all dressing*.

DIG Pag. 97. *lantep*, r *you should*, p. 100. l 30. r. *good*, p. 102. *gratia operans*, p. 103. l. 35. r. *do*, p. 107. r. *admixtionem*, p 109 l. 19 *and*, r. *or*. p. 117. l. *pen them*, r. *you*, p. 119. l. 36. r. *for*, l. *pen of*, l. 31. r. *yet they*, p. 126 l. 16. *goodnesse*, r. *goods*, p. 128. l. 33. r. *others*, p. 131. l. 11. *as* Mr. p. 135. l. 13. *place*, r. *line*, p. 136. *Acali Farax*, p. 141. l. 14 *instances*, r. *mistakes*.

CHAP. V. Pag. 5. l. 35. *thought*, r. *though*, p. 7. l. 19. r. *nor*, p 12. l. 48. *fame*, r. *for me*, p. 13. l. 41. *save*, r. *sure*, p. 20. r. *juncta*, p. 31. l. 3, del. *three*, p. 32. l. 33. r. *make them persevere*, p. 35. l. 51. r. *by any man*, p. 42. *breath*, r. *beasts*, p. 53. l. 4. r. *saw*, p. 54. l. 14. r. *disprove*, p. 57 l. 11. del. *all*, p. 60. l. 6. r. *and can*, r. *man*, p. 63. 48. *such life*, r. *life somuch*, p. 77. l. *antp.* r. *masterie*, p. 80. l. 9. *more*, r. *none*, l. 34. *That*, r. *Christ*.

CHAP. VI Pag. 82. l. 32. r. *prescind*, p. 86. l. 2. *no*, r. 4, l. 16. del. *said*, p. 87. l. 51. *sinnes*, r. *sinners*, p. 89 *fancie*, r. *facultie*, l. 32. *nature*, r. *matter*, transp. *beyond all conscience*, into next line.

CHAP. VII. Pag. 94. 22. *plea*, r. *place*, p. 95. *agnoverint*, p. 107. l. 36. *by*, r. *into*, l. 43. 2. *instinctis*, p. 116. l. 5. *well*, r. *walls*, p. 126. l. 44. *this*, r. *is*, Item, p. 127. p. 136.

Chap. 5. Pag. 62. *Deest.* Chap. 11. Sect. 56. Chap. 5. pag. 32. *Deest.* Chap. 4. Sect. 18. Chap. 5. p. 29. *Deest.* Chap. 3. Sect. 19.

THe Reader may please to know that the Articles of *Lambeth* mentioned, *Chap. 7. p.* 129, were by the Convocation in *Ireland*, 1615. inserted into the body of their Articles, almost word for word.

nail. Now how *certitudo fidei* can ſtand without *certitudo ſalutis*, or *certitudo ſalutis* without *certitudo perſeverantiæ*, would be very well worth the learning. *Stapleton acriter hoc urget* (as Dr. *Prideaux* obſerveth) againſt them, and indeed as juſtly, if they held that men might be *certain* of their *ſalvation*, and yet their *perſeverance* be *uncertain*; but by your leave they affirm, that the perſeverance of the *elect* is ſure, and that the *elect* may be ſure of their perſeverance; nor doth Dr. *Prideaux* in this *Lect. de certitudine*, do more then alleadg *Stapletons* preſſing them with this abſurdity, he doth not ſay the Lutherans are guilty of it: And howbeit he ſay ſomewhat more in his *Lecture de perſev.* yet that is but *this*, that the *Pſeudo-Lutherans* deny perſeverance, and that in this *turpiter à præceptore deficiunt*, yea and that they deny ſo, only as to affirm a total, but not a final Apoſtaſie of the Saints, that he ſaith they yield. And I am ſure, *Gerhard* diſputes it at large, ſo doth *Brochman*, take theſe paſſages for a taſte.

1. For *Gerhard*, by the ſame token he laies this for his ground, *Quorum fides non defecit de perſeverantia certi eſſe poſſunt.* He quotes a paſſage out of the Canon Law, *Quorum fides quæ per delectionem & amorem operatur omnino non deficit, aut ſi qui ſint quorum deficit, reparatur antequam vitaiſta finiatur, & deleta quæ intercurrerat iniquitate ad finem perſeverantiæ deputatur. Can. firmum diſt. 2. depen.*

See *Gerhard Confeſſ. Cathol. lib. 2. part. 3. art. 23. cap. 5.* by whom are quoted,

Bernard.
Joh. Gerſon.
Enchirid. Coloniense.
Jacobus Valdius.
Cenſura Colonienſ. Dial. 4.
Jac. Sadoletus ex Rivio.
Anton. Marinarius,
Pet. Suavis.
Cornel. Muſſus.
Petrus de Ribaden.
Bellarmin.
Adam. Tanner.
Coſterus, &c.
Almericus Gallus ex Vincentio.
Johannes Weſſelius.
Catech. Romanus.
Claudius Guillandus.
Geo. Caſſander.
Alph. de Caſtro.
Amb. Catharinus.
Peſantius. Johannes Ferus.
Mart. Eyſengren.
Ben. Pererius.
Greg. de Valent.
Cornelius à Lapide.

All as concurring with him in this Point of Certainty.

By this Catalogue the Reader may ſee how eaſie it is to muſter up names, and how little learning will ſerve to ſtuff out a whole Volume with quotations.

Then farther, *Ger. Conf. Cath. lib. 2. par. 3. art. 22. p. 514.* Where he propoſeth an Argument againſt himſelf thus, *De perſev. nemo poteſt eſſe certus, ergo nec de elect.*

And anſwers, *Reſp. ex Salm. tom. 8. trac. 19. p. 149. Hic ſcrupulus vincendus eſt fide tanti Regis (Chriſti) & ſalutis noſtræ ſitientiſſimi. vide.*

And for *Brochman*, howbeit you ſay Dr. *Prideaux* coupleth the Lutherans with the Remonſtrants or Arminians (who yet are only *Pſeudo-Lutherans*) yet whatever Dr. *Prideaux* doth, *Brochman*, a Lutheran much eſteemed by Dr. *Prideaux*, doth in this very particular couple the Papiſts and Arminians together, *Cui Arminianorum & Pontificiorum Dogmati longe periculoſiſſimo varia opponimus argumenta. 1. Deum arguit mendacii. 2. E Diametro pugnat cum ſine Revelata doctrina de prædeſtinatione æterna ad ſalutem. De Pred. q. 8. & Cap. 1. Sect. 4. de elect. certitud. rotundo ore confirmat Chriſtus.*

Yet let them all run that way, we are not ſolicitous to follow them; we humbly conceive they are never the *better reformed*, for keeping this piece of old Romiſh *leaven*, and it is as facile for us to ſay that the Lutheran Reformers had not *leaſure* enough to *ſweep out all the duſt*, as it was for you to ſay that the Calviniſts (as ſome pleaſe to entitle them) did in their *haſte* ſweep out *ſundry pearls with the duſt*. If the Doctrine

Doctrine of Apostasie be a *pearl*, yet there is many a piece of *glass* that is better. Sir, we look on the Doctrine of Perseverance, as one of the choicest *Jewels* in the Churches *Cabinet*, as that which *quickens* the dulness, *cures* the sadness, *fortifies* the resolutions of the Saints; and howbeit you say these are [importune and senseless acclamations to it, and that it is but a superstitious ignorance and weakness, that doth this devotion to it;] yet we regardless what nicknames you please to honour us with, profess to owe the Doctrine of Perseverance, for so much sweet comfort in the midst of heavie temptations, and seasonable encouragement to holy duties, that we have reason to bless God for those *precious promises* of *keeping us through faith to salvation*, which this Doctrine insists on, as a *chief means* whereby he keeps us from *defiling our selves with all filthiness of the flesh and spirit*. May others look upon it as [a Pillow of Satans making,] we profess it to be rather Gods *bell* to awaken us to a holy carefulness. The *flesh* hath no encouragement from this Doctrine to *rest*; the tenor of it being, that the *flesh* shall be curbed all along, and at last *consumed*, in as many as have the *spirit*. May others look upon it as a [Doctrine unworthy the purity, holiness, wisdom, and unpartial integrity of God,] they shew *their mistake*; *He that hath this hope, purifieth himself even as God is pure*.

You proceed to shew, that [Those who make one shoulder with *Calvin* to lift up the same body, or frame of Doctrine with him, though they ordinarily, or at least frequently, oppose the Lutheran sense, in the Point of Perseverance, yet are necessitated, whatever be the matter or cause of it, to speak things of a clear and perfect consonancy with it.] SECT. 19.

And first you begin with [*Calvin*, who saith of the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, *Laudat quod bene caperint, sed ne pretextu gratiæ, quam consequuti sunt, earnis indulgeant securitati, dicit opus esse perseverantiâ.*] I trow we all say the same. 1. Did ever any of your weak adversaries say Perseverance was a *needless thing*? If they *thought so*, why contended they so earnestly that *God keeps his Saints*, so as to make them persevere in *faith* and *holiness*? if their perseverance were *needless*, they *needed not* trouble themselves so much in *disputing for it*.

Secondly, Did ever any say that *security is not apt to steal upon the best Saints*, and *that under a pretence of that grace which they have received*? We yield the *flesh* is apt to catch advantages to it self, from the graces of the *spirit*; only the *spirit* makes the Saints the *more carefull*, the more they are sensible how prone they are, if left to *themselves*, to become *secure*. Well but [*Calvin* goes on, *Nam plerique delibato tantum evangelio, quasi ad summum pervenerint, de profectu non cogitant.*] Too true, but it fares with them in matters of *holiness*, as *Seneca* observed, it did with some others in matters of *wisdom*, *Ad sapientiam perveniissent, nisi se perveniisse credidissent*. But this is so with those only [*qui deliberarunt tantum evangelium*] and licked so little of it, that they have tasted only some few *obvious truths* of it, and scarce that. Now let him add, [*Ita fit, ut in non medio modo stadio, adeoque prope ipsos carceres desidant, sed alio vertunt cursum suum.*] And we grant it, of too too many. *Negari non potest, Celari non debet*. This present age hath yielded too many examples of such who have run so uncertainly, and not only *sate down*, but *turned quite a contrary way*. We have the patience to transcribe the rest, which you quote out of *Calvin*. [*Speciosa quidem est ista objectio, Quid ultra volumus; postquam adepti sumus Christum? Verum si fide possidetur, in ea perstandum est, ut nobis perpetua maneat possessio. Ergo hac lege se nobis fruendum dedit Christus, ut eadem, qua in ejus participationem admissi sumus, fide, tantum bonum conservemus usque ad mortem.*] *Calv.* in *Heb.* 3. 14. What make you of this? Why [the conditionality of perseverance in the Saints, yea the non-perseverance of some of them, cannot lightly be asserted in terms more significant and expres; to tell men that *they must persist in faith*, to *make the possession of Christ perpetual unto them*; and to inform them withall that God will by an irresistible hand of power, make, or constrain them to *persist in faith*, is to tie plummets of lead to a mans heels, to make him run the faster.]

But first, I find no *Conditionality of perseverance* in these words of *Calvin*, but

but perseverance rather set forth as a *Condition of salvation*: He speaks not of *faith*, I hope, as a *Condition of persevering in faith*, but of *persevering in faith*, as a *condition of possessing Christ*, or the *benefits* purchased by Christ to *eternity*.

Secondly, what may he not tell men, tho *they must persist in faith to make the possession of Christ perpetual unto them*, and ad withall, that God will by an irresistible hand of power, *make* them to *persist* in faith? I am deceived, if God tell not men that they must have *new hearts*, if they will be eternally happie, and yet withall informs them that he will *make them new hearts*, and *keep* them that *they shall not depart from him*.

This is not [like lead tied to mens heels] which would *hinder* them, but as *lead* tied to a *Clocks wheels*, which makes them *run the faster*: Tell God, you had best, that he *forget himself*, when to *encourage* his people in the *ways* of his *Commandments*, he informs them *he will order it*, that they shall *not depart from him*: It is some *quicksilver* in your nimbler head, that talks of this [*Lead* at mens heels to make them run the faster.]

But 3. *Calvin* speaks not *upon the place* of Gods *irresistible hand of power*, as [*making*] and *no where* as [*constraining*] his Saints to persist in faith.

4. In short, You do not here alleadg *Calvin*, as *asserting the Doctrine of Apostasie*, but only shew how silly soul he miserably *contradicts* his dear *Doctrine of Perseverance*, by a thing called *Consequence*, whereof poore man he was not aware.

But 2. In the next passage you catch this same *John Calvin*, at a hop of greater advantage. [*Nunc videat quæso vanus ille, nempe Apostatas, qui se à Christi Evangelio, quod prius amplexerant, & à Dei gratia, alienarunt, quod nemini contingit, nisi qui peccet in Spiritum sanctum.*] What follows as you worthily mention it? [*Nec certe Deus alios, ita gratia sua spoliat nisi Reprobos, ut illis nihil faciat residuum.*] Make as much of this as you can against the *perseverance of the elect*. When *Reprobi* may be Englished *Elect*, possibly you may be a *saver* by this *costly quotation*, which runs on thus, [*Si quis reget cur talis Apostasia mentionem hic faciat Apostolus, cum fideles compellet, qui* procul aberant à tam scelerata perfidia.] I wonder whether *that too*, contribute any thing towards the proof of the Apostasie of the Saints? [*Respondeo, maturè abeo indicari periculum, ne sibi præcaveam. Quod notatu operæ pretium est, nam cum arctâ via destituimur, non tantum excusamus apud alios vitia nostra, sed nobis quoque ipsis imponimus.*] Right; and therefore is there the more need of such seasonable *cautions*, against the danger of *backsliding*, and these *cautions* are used by God, as *means* to prevent our *backslidings*, and make *less backslidings*, preventions of *greater*; and such as [*Calvin* here saith] *none but the Reprobate are guilty of*, which it seems proves him a *secret friend* to the *Doctrine of Apostasie*. And he is so fond of it, good man, that he cannot hold from opening himself more fully in its behalf, as much as it reflects to his own dishonour. [In his Comment upon *Mat.* 24. 13. where he hath words to this purpose, *Although the love of many being surcharged with the weight of iniquities shall fall, yet Christ admonisheth that this obstacle also must be overcome; lest those that are faithfull, being tired out with evil examples, should start back: Therefore he repeats that saying, that none shall be saved but he that shall strive lawfully, so as to persevere.*]

What I wis are these *evil examples*, with which the faithfull are apt to be *tyred out*? *The Examples of such* as having *pretended love*, decline to *uncharitableness*, and *infidelity*, *are apt to tyre the faithfull*, how? *by suggesting a fear that they shall decline after the example of others Apostasie*.

Now saith *Calvin*, *This obstacle also must be overcome*, that is, *this fear of falling, as others have done*, which doubtless makes exceedingly for the *Doctrine of Apostasie*. You see here, this *fear of falling* is to be *overcome* that they may *stand*, that this *fear of falling* may be *overcome*: he saith Christ repeats that saying, *that none should be saved, but he that strives lawfully*. But how doth *this help to overcome that fear*, unless there were *somewhat also supposed*, viz. *that if they were truly faithfull they shall be enabled to strive lawfully, and to persevere to the end*? The *needfulness* of their *perseverance*, without some *ground* of the *certainty* of their perseverance, would *never*

overcome that *obstacle*, which our Saviour endeavours to *remove out of the way*. But *Calvin* not satisfied to expres himself in this peaceable and calm way, as a cordial well-wisher to your Doctrine of Apostasie [in his Commentaries upon the Epistle to the Galatians, he in a warlike manner, [bids defiance to his own Doctrine of Perseverance once in these words, *Arguit enim eos defectionis, non à sua Doctrina tantum, sed à Christo. Nam Christum tenere aliter non poterant, quam si agnoscerent, ejus beneficio nos manumissos esse à servitute legis.* Calv. in Gal. 1.6.]

This Testimony, say you [Cannot be eluded with this accustomed put-off, *viz.* that he speaks not of falling away from true faith, but from the Doctrine of faith, or from the profession of faith, because he saith, the Apostle convinceth them, or reproveth them for falling away from *Christ himself*, which is every way as much, if not somewhat more then falling away from *true faith*.] Why but may not men *follow* Christ, and so *fall* from him, without *true faith*? I think *Judas* will not be proved in haste to have had *true faith* because he *followed* Christ, and much less because he *fell* from him. There is many a man *follows* Christ for other commodities then his *miracles*, and is led by the *fashion* rather then his *faith*.

1. Men fall away from *Christ himself*, when from professing his Doctrine, stiled *Christ*, Eph. 4. *Ye have not so learned Christ*.

2. Men *fall away* from *Christ himself* when they *fall off* from communion with his *Church*, stiled *Christ*, 1 Cor. 12. *Many goe out from us, that were never of us*.

And 3. Why may not men be said *to fall away from Christ himself*, when they fall from the *love* they did bear, and do owe to any *servant of Christ*? What is done to such a one, Christ accounts as done to *himself*; and so the *falling away* from *such a one*, as the *falling from Christ himself*. Whether this *Himself*, have any extraordinary Emphasis, I know not, but sure it is not in the *Latine*; only you might have made a little more of these words of *Calvin*, *Christ* being opposed to *his Doctrine*, *Non à sua doctrina tantum sed à Christo*; but then *suâ* helps the matter, and carries this in it, that *Pauls Doctrine* was not *his own* but *Christs*, and a falling away from *Pauls Doctrine*, was no less then a falling from *Christ himself*: Whereas you gravely subjoyn, that [it is not to be supposed that *Calvin* himself, holding that the Apostle charged them with falling away from Christ, should hold that they had not thus fallen away, this being no less then to charge the Apostle with charging the Galatians untruely.] It is true indeed, if *Calvin* hold that the Galatians *fell not away from Christ in that sense wherein the Apostle chargeth them to have fallen away*; but he may both *deny them* to have *fallen in your sense*, and yet grant they *fell* in the *Apostles sense*, without any such parlous contradiction.

Well but [Besides, saying that they could not *tenere Christum, i. e.* retain; or keep their hold or possession of Christ, but upon such and such terms, he plainly supposeth that a present hold or possession of Christ may be lost.] Yes; but the question will be, *what* [present hold or possession of Christ?] *what* is meant by *Christ*? *what* by the *hold* or *possession* of *Christ*? whether this [*tenere Christum*] be as much as to *possess Christ*? and that the word will not be satisfied with *professe* Christ: *tenere* is not used in the *Schools*, as it is in the *Courts*, for to *have* and to *hold*; but a *Tenet* is no more then a *Point of Doctrine*, and *tenere Christum*, or *cum Christo*, sounds no more then a *profession* of his *Doctrine*, not a *possession* of his *Spirit*. And methinks these words, [*Christum tenere aliter non poterant, quam si agnoscerent &c.*] seem to intimate, wherein their *tenere* consisted, *viz.* in *agnoscere*: and lastly I am not satisfied, that [*Christum aliter tenere non poterant*] signifies that they *did actually hold Christ in any sense*. If Mr. *Goodwin* can prove, that he who *cannot hold a thing but upon such or such terms*, doth *actually hold it without those terms*, he will doe more then all the subtile Sophisters in *Westminster* Hall will doe all the next Term, though it were twice as long as it is, let them wrangle never so much about it: All the *servientes* may be [*manumissi*] from their [*servitute legis*] and Mr. *Goodwin* take their room at the Bar. I see he can prove, that a man who *cannot hold* his Estate, hath it *fast and sure*, to all intents and purposes.

[Elſewhere (ſay you) in the ſame Epiſtle] you mean Comment on it [the ſame Doctrine goes to wrack, by the Pen of the great Patron, or founder rather of it in theſe words, *The meaning is, if you ſeek for any part, or piece of righteouſneſs, in the works of the Law, Chriſt becomes nothing to you, and you aliens from grace. For their opinion was not ſo groſs, as that they thought they ſhould be juſtified by the alone obſervation of the Law, but they mingled Chriſt with the Law. Otherwiſe* Paul *ſhould have had no ground to have terrified them, with ſuch threatnings as theſe, What do you mean? you take a courſe to make Chriſt unprofitable to you; you bring his grace to nothing. Thus then we ſee, that we cannot place, no not the leaſt part of our righteouſneſs in the Law, but we renounce Chriſt and his grace.*]

I cannot diſcern how the Doctrine of Perſeverance, is in any danger from theſe words; which proceeding by way of *ſuppoſition* do not *aſſert* any thing *de facto*. You may as well inferr, that when I ſay, *If Mr.* Goodwins *Book be unanſwerable*, and his *Churches judgment upon it infallible, the common Doctrine of Perſeverance is like to fall, ſo as never to riſe again*, I aſſert the *fall* of this *Doctrine*, whiles I am labouring to *ſupport* it. Yea but [1. *Renunciation* hath no place but in ſuch things as were formerly, either held, practiſed, or poſſeſt; therefore if men renounce Chriſt and his Grace, they formerly held, practiſed, or poſſeſt it: be it ſo, in *profeſſion*, and now they *renounce* that they *profeſſed* before, to *owe Chriſt* and *his grace alone* for *their righteouſneſs*. Now they *renounce* what they *formerly profeſſed*, they aſcribe not ſo much honour as they formerly did, to Chriſt and his grace; but even *when they profeſſed moſt to honour Chriſt and his grace*, they might do it but from *their teeth*, as we ſay, not from their *hearts*. [2. Nor can the *grace of Chriſt* be ſaid to be brought to *nothing*, in reference unto any man unto whom it was never *any thing*;] yes, if it *would have been ſomewhat to him*. As for inſtance, when I ſay, *you will if you do this, make ſuch an act of grace*, ſuppoſe a *general pardon unprofitable*, and bring it to *nothing*. Further, Sir, grace doth not ſignifie only *grace inherent in us*, but as I may ſay, *grace offered to us*, a *favour* which *we ſhould receive*, as well as a *change of heart which we do enjoy*; and ſo much you take notice of in your next words, [He that never had, or enjoyed the *grace, favour*, or *good will* of *Chriſt*, cannot by any courſe or practice whatſoever, be ſaid to bring it to nothing;] but he that enjoyed but an *oportunity* of enjoying the grace, favour, or good will of Chriſt, muſt acknowledg that *oportunity*, a *grace* and *favour*; and bringing that *oportunity* to *nothing*, may well be ſaid to *bring the grace, favour*, or *goodwill* of Chriſt to *nothing*, albeit he never enjoyed more then an *oportunity of enjoying* it, which was indeed a *grace*, but not that which he *might have enjoyed*, had he husbanded that *opportunity*, and ſo he loſt that *greater grace*, which he never had. Did you never hear of thoſe, *qui vitam tripuerunt nondum datam*? We may well enough be ſaid to *loſe* a thing before we be *ſeized* of it.

Here you make a ſtand, and breath your ſelf awhile upon *Calvin*, telling us [how ill your Readers patience would bear the multitudes of places] which you [upon a little ſearch could find in this one Author, ſtriking at the very face of the Doctrine of Perſeverance;] yea and that [you verily believe, that there is every whit as much to be found in his Writings againſt this Doctrine, as for it; yet will you infer hence, not ſo much the inſtability of judgment, in ſo worthy a man.] Your weakeſt Reader may do that without your help. [But the ſignal uſefulneſs, or neceſſity of ſuch a poſition in Chriſtianity, without the help whereof, thoſe that are enemies unto it, know not how to manage their Chriſtian occaſions or affairs.]

But ſurely they are not only *weak*, but *wicked*, who profeſs hoſtility to a Doctrine, whereof they have ſuch continual *uſe*, and which deſerves ſo highly of them, for the aſſiſtance it lends them in all [their Chriſtian affairs] which would miſerably miſcarry without it. If this Doctrine be ſo uſefull to them, they are very unthankfull to it, *& ingratos ſi dixeris*, you may add what you will; plainly you call them at once both *fools* and *knaves*, as we ſay by *craft*: no better then *fools* if they *underſtand not* the Doctrine, whether they *uſe* it, or *oppoſe* it, they ſhew their *wit* alike. *Knaves* if *underſtanding it*, and *knowing it* to be *falſe*, they will *preach it* on any *occaſion*, for any *purpoſe*. *Pia fraus*, is no better then *impia*; He is the worſt man who

is

is *facto, pius, & sceleratus, eodem. Verier knaves*, if understanding it, and *knowing it* to be *true*, they presume to *dispute* so industriously *against it*. As you carry it, you put them into a fair capacity of a place, either in one or other of those honourable Societies.

Stultorum Bedlam nebulonum Regia Bridewell.

And not satisfying your self to dignifie them thus, in this one particular, you subjoyn that [you shall make the like observation upon them] questionless out of especial observance [in reference to all the other main points held forth and argued in this your Treatise, in Opposition to Vulgar Tenets, presuming themselves Orthodox, because Vulgar.] Tenents the more vulgar they are among *Orthodox* men, the more reason they have to think themselves *honourable*, but if the *Patrons* of those *Tenents* be fain to borrow the help of their *Adversaries Doctrines* to *save* their *reputation*, or *do* their *business*, they are unworthy the name of Orthodox, or honest, or knowing. It is much easier for you to *accuse*, then to *prove* them guilty; as much dirt as you throw, you do not so much defile their faces, as your own fingers.

After this Welch bait, you go on to add another Testimony from *Calvin*, wherein [he doth not only, or simply assert a possibility, both of the total and final falling away of true believers, but of a frequent reduction of such a possibility into act. The place is in his Commentaries upon 2 *Pet.* 2. *Vix enim decimus quisque, eorum qui Christo nomen dederunt, fidei puritatem ad extremum usque retinet. Omnes fere ad corruptelas degenerant, atque à magistris licentia delusi, profanescunt.*] But do you think, or do you think that *Calvin* did think, that the *greater part* of those who had given *their names* to Christ, have the *spirit* of Christ? yea or those that *profess purity of faith, profess faith in purity*? Sir, they receive the *purity of faith* into *impure hearts*; which though their *months* were *Christians*, were alwaies *infidels*; a man may have the *pure doctrine of faith*, without *pure faith* according to the *Doctrine*. You shut up all at length with this ponderous conclusion. [So that what *Austin* said long since concerning *Tertullian*, that being acute, or sharp-witted, he was sometimes overcome with a sight of the truth, contrary to his opinion, may truly be said of *Calvin* also; a sight of the truth] forsooth, even [contrary to his standing judgment and opinion, now and then glanced in upon him, and overcame him, subjecting his pen and conscience at once for a season unto her service, however the vision ceasing, anticipated thoughts, it is like, soon recovered their former possession.]

I make no question but as much acuteness and sharpwittedness as you would seem here to acknowledg in *Calvin*, you indeed take it to be *dulness* and *obtuseness*, that he saw not the inconsistency of these cursorie passages, with his [*standing judgment*;] and as much as you overlook the common Preachers of this Doctrine of Perseverance, as dull, drie Fellows. I doubt not but you will graciously vouchsafe them your Testimony for the like [*acuteness* and *sharpwittedness*] with *Calvin*, upon this *score of contradicting* most ingenuously, their *Doctrine* by their *Use*. Mr. *Goodwin* in the mean time, shews only *his own acuteness* in discovering *contradiction* in those passages, which duller wits conceive sufficiently *reconciled*.

After this testimony of *Calvin*, you proceed to produce some others from *Musculus, Martyr, Aretius, Bullinger, Piscator, Diodat, Junius*; but not without this acknowledgment in your transition, that [they followed *Calvin* in the same unhappy undertaking against your Doctrine, only they had the happiness to be overcome by the truth, against their wills.] Whether this make more for the glory of your Doctrine, or the dishonor of these Doctors, I know not, but am to examin what they say.

Appear *Musculus*,

Who notwithstanding the large quotation you produce, is directly against the *loss of justification*. Let the Reader but have the patience to consult him in the very entrance of this his 6. Sect. dist. Cap. de Remissione peccatorum. *Nisi firma sit in sempiternum remissionis gratia, non poterit salus nostra constans esse & firma. Neque enim alia nobis reliqua est ratio, per quam salvimur si ista concidat, & irrita reddatur; actum esse*

statur,

igitur, ut peccata ſemel remiſſa ſint in ſempiternum, niſi vana eſt omnis illa Doctrina & promiſſio de vita ac ſalute æterna; per Chriſtum humano generi parta; quod ſine impietate cogitare non poterit; eſt hoc quidem certum, & indubitate tenendum. And afterward for ſanctification, *Aliud eſt ſimpliciter peccare quod accidit etiam filiis Dei, aliud prorſus è gratiâ Dei excidere, prolabi, Chriſtum ab integro crucifigere & ludibrio exponere quod* reproborum eſt. *ibid.*

And again, *Poſſit mihi objici hoc in loco, relapſum ejuſmodi, per quem peccata ſemel remiſſa reddantur irrita locum in electis habere non poſſe, immo ne in reprobis quidem, quod illi remiſſionis peccatorum capaces eſſe nequeant, eo quod verâ & vivâ fide, per quam illa acquiritur, præditi non ſint; ideoque neminem eſſe prorſus, in quo peccata ſemel remiſſa irrita fieri poſſint. Verum eos qui hoc argumento ducuntur moneo, ut de* reprobis *quod dicunt, diligentius perpendant, De electis conſentio, de reprobis vero nullane illis unquam peccatorum remiſſio contingat, diſputari poſſe intelligo. Ibid.*

Such a remiſſion he it ſeems allows the Reprobrates, as Mr. *Ball* doth, after a ſort; and ſuch a one few of us deny. For an anſwer to your paſſage of [Remiſſion of ſins recalled,] I remit you to what hath been ſaid formerly of the ſame Argument.

2. For the paſſage you quote of his *Loc. de peccato. Sect.* 5.

He tels you plainly, *Non poteſt fieri, ut qui vera fide præditi ſunt, ad hunc modum enormiter, impiè, ſcelerate, & deplorate peccent.* And when any fall ſo far as to trample under foot the bloud of Chriſt, he denies they are in a capacity of *returning*; and to this it is, that that paſſage of his which you ſo much inſiſt on relates [*Scio hic à nonnullis aliter ſentiri, verum quid mihi videatur, abſque illorum injuria libere dico.*]

3. Well but ſay you [for the clearneſs and throughneſs of his judgment, on that ſide of the Controverſie on which we ſtand, ſeveral other paſſages of his writings ſpeak home. *Animus enim ad hunc modum contriſtatus, facile eo labitur, ut incipiat ſenſim per ſiniſtram ſuſpicionem labefactus deficere à Chriſtianiſmo, & vera fide.*] So I think do many *deficere à Chriſtianiſmo*, who were never Saints; Chriſtians by *name*; but who *while* they *had a name that they lived*, *were indeed dead*; *& à vera fide*, in regard of the *Doctrine*, who had never the *grace* of faith. This is true of the Galatians, and ſome others who fell by our confeſſion, as well as *Muſculus's*, and from *remiſſion of ſins too in a ſort*, as your old friend Mr. *Ball* doth well enough expreſs it.

2. And this is as much as *Peter Martyr* intended, in the place you alleadg in 1. *ad Cor.* 13, 2. witneſs his own words, *Fidem iſtorum poſſe quidem veram appellari, quoad ea quæ fatentur, ſed quoad ipſam fidem, ſed naturam ipſius excutiamus, non eſt germana, & legitima fides.* And he illuſtrates it by two inſtances, one whereof is, that the Turks themſelves may be ſaid to have *veram fidem*, in regard of ſome Articles of the Chriſtian faith, as the Almightineſs of God, *&c.* The Turks are according to him, as good Chriſtians, as ſome of your Saints in this Book.

3. Nor is this more then *B. Aretius* intends by his [*Converſi*,] of which you make ſo much, *Converted* to *profeſſe* the *Chriſtian faith*, not *converted* ſo as to be *regenerate*.

4. *Bullinger*, I grant underſtands *faith* in another ſenſe [*Nobis interim ſit ſatis, quod æterna felicitas nobis eſt in tuto, quam nullus hominum, aut dæmonum, poſſit intervipere, modo nè nos deficiat fides, qua neglectis rebus mortalium, toti pendeamus à Cœlo.* He (ſay you) that ſuppoſeth or affirmeth a man to be out of all danger, or poſſibility of periſhing, but only in caſe of a failing of his faith, neceſſarily ſuppoſeth, 1. That ſuch a man is at preſent inveſted with ſuch a faith, which is of the *ſaving kind*: And 2. That there is a poſſibility that this faith may fail him before his end.] Yea I pray add if you pleaſe, that there is an *impoſſibility* that his faith ſhould *not fail*, unleſs it were continually ſupported by the gracious influence of the *Spirit of God*. We ſay ſo, whatever you doe; and ſo we allow both *Bullingers Text*, and *your Comment* on it.

5. But next, who would have ſuſpected that ever old *John Piſcator* ſhould have been

been *hooked* in by you, to bear witnes against this unfortunate Doctrine of Perseverance? questionless he is out of his element, as much as a fish out of the water, and will soon be as mute, as much as you would enforce him to speak for you. Well but,

Adunera magni quidem mihi, sed mihi in bonis.

He then in his *Scholia* upon *Rom.* 14. 15. makes the Apostle say, *That a believer for whom Christ died, may through an offence taken, forsake the profession of the Gospel, and so perish out of the faith of Christ.* And what is this, being interpreted, but to affirm, that true believers, even such, for whom Christ died, may fall away, so as to perish *in peccato, id est, offendato, ex Domini fidei professione desinente, atque ita extra Christi fidem percat, Mediatoris effectu, pro quo mortuus est, quoad nos privato, pro omnibus credentibus.*

But hath not this Learned Author cleared himself in his Analysis for *credentibus*, i. e. faith he, *ex judicio charitatis* only; and so for *pro quibus Christus mortuus est*, in *judicio charitatis*. *Piscators* testimony then is not worth a *gudgeon*; a hundred of these scarce make a *penni worth*; *Potuit quo minoris*

Piscator quam pisces ejus.

But if *Piscator* will not, yet *Davenant* shall doe the doe [*Perish*, saith he, *shall be in danger of wounding his conscience mortally, and he may be [somewhat in the] shipwrack of his salvation.* 1. He that is *dead*, is in no danger of being *wounded mortally*; but he who being *alive*, is in this danger, is in a possibility at least of suffering accordingly. 2. Nor can any person be said to make *shipwrack of that*, of which he never was *possest*, nor yet to be in *danger* hereof.] 1. I am not satisfied, but that he who is *dead*, may be *wounded mortally*. I think that *cutting of the head* is a *mortal blow*; and that a *dead man* may have such execution done on him. I am sure I have heard of an old woman, that seeing her good man break his neck with a fall from a house, a hatchet hanging at his girdle, solemnly blessed God, that *he had no more hair*. Sir, a wound is said to be mortal, not because it doth *actually bring death*, but because it is such as *cannot be cured*, and I think a *less wound* in a *dead man*, is in this respect the more *mortal*. But seriously I would fain know whether a man that hath committed the *sin against the holy Ghost*, cannot commit a *mortal sin after it*? he should not be in a capacity to do it upon your grounds, because he is *dead already*, and *cannot be wounded*.

2. We deny not but the man who is most alive spiritally, is in danger of being *wounded thus mortally*, and not only in a *possibility* of suffering accordingly, but in an *impossibility* of *not suffering*, if left to *himself*. Or he like we say of [*suffering shipwrack*.] So that *Diodati* testimony is not like to go far in *Davenant*, for any harm it will ever do to our Doctrine.

3. Nor doe we more fear it will suffer from the Reverend hand of our Learned *Ward*. For what if he say [*Si non posse fieri, ut justus, vel evadat aliquis defectus; neque Hypothesin hanc fecturus esset Apostolus, neque ex Hypothesi tam gravi pronunciaturus illaturus, neque ad hanc anxiam, quæ agitur, hortationem Hebræos, quibus scribebat accommodaturus. Pun. in Parallel. ad Heb. 6. 4, 5, 6.*] For we deny not but that [*potest fieri ut justus vel evadat aliquis defectus*] in regard of himself; we say he cannot *stand*, so far are we from saying he *cannot fall*. But I pray what doth *Ward* subjoyn? [*Sed iqua indefinitarum propositionum, quæ quidem contingentes sunt, universalis est, ut nunquam dici universales possint, propriè, & per se, propterea quod ullus eorum numero qui dona illa perceperunt, esse qui excidant, & esse qui non excidunt, nec possunt excidere.* Such he esteems all the Elect. *Lord* is too much our friend to hurt us by his *good will*, and too *wise* to do it *against his will*. Let him speak on therefore and spare not [*A Domino nihil plane desiderandum est, nisi ne nobis deficiamus ipsi.*] Do any of us use to make bones of such words as these, if we be not *wanting to our duty*, *God will not be wanting to us in his dewty*! What hath *Arminius*

more

more to say against us? [*Christus postulat à nobis unicam conditionem, nempe ut maneamus in ipso, & circumspiciamus, attendamusque nobis, ab omni peccato, & infidelitate; quemadmodum ipse in nobis spondet, se mansurum esse.*] I hope you shall find us all as liberal of such expressions, and as forward to call upon men to look about them, and perform Conditions in order to their salvation; the promise whereof we say is Conditional, as loudly as your self. But saith *Junius* upon the place, *Christus sine conditione, præstat fidei, quæcunque ops sunt ad sanctificationem ipsorum.* Their remaining in him is indeed a Condition, not only of their salvation, but their comfort; but his remaining in them, is that which gives them grace to remain in him. And so I humbly take leave of this Honoured Author.

8. But *Mollerus* strikes so hard at us, that we all fall before him. [Upon Psal. 51. 12. he Commenteth, *that* David *lost the holy Ghost by his sin,*] That is expounded by what follows, [and was deprived of his gifts] he tels you not in whole, we acknowledg in part without any offence taken by our Doctrine. Onward [so that he departing from, or not governing *David*, as formerly, his heart became polluted with wickedness of all sorts] that is a little Hyperbolical, [*Therefore he praies that a clean heart might be again created in him*] that word is Tropical, not proper, [*which the Apostle cals an heart purified by faith*] and so I hope may, and must, the *purest heart on earth*, much more in case of *pollution contracted*, be purified; [*that so he might have right thoughts of God.*] Mr. *Goodwin* belike hath so accurate notions of God, that he neither doth, nor needeth use this prayer. [*Might truly acknowledg God without hypocrisie, or simulation*] The sincerer Saints are, the more they are wont, and conceive they have cause to pray in this kind [*but might come to call upon him, believe on him, fear, obey him, &c.*] I hope as long as we live, we shall never be past the use of this *Prayer*. Howbeit Mr. *Goodwin* saith that [these words clearly suppose a total Apostasie, and that this Text needs no Commentary.] We all need this prayer when we *stand uprightest* and *firmest*, and he who thinks he needs it not, shewes he is desperately fallen by so presumptuous a conceit of his standing.

SECT. 23. You gravely tell us [You might add the Testimony, both of former Councels and Synods] out of your old friend *Vossius*, [and of many late Reformed Churches] out of your dear Comrade *Bertius*. But [you chuse to refer your Reader to these Authors respectively] and only [imbulk your Discourse] with a snatch out of [the Confession of the Reformed Churches of *Saxony*.] But I doubt this Saxonian Confession will be but so much sand, and so [this taste] will satisfie the Reader, unless his stomack be so sharp set as to be ready to digest any more gravel your liberality shall be pleased to feed him with.

[When it is said (saith the Confession) that sins remain in the Regenerate, it is necessary that a difference be made: for from that saying *Luke* 11. *He goes and takes to him seven worse spirits*, and the like sayings, it is manifest that some regenerate persons grieve and shake, or dash the holy Spirit out of them, are again cast off by God, and become guilty of the wrath of God, and of eternal punishment.] 1. The [dashing] is but a dash of your own pen, to shew how well it can acquit it self at the exercise of variation. *Scribe cum dasso.* 2. It appears not by the Text, that the men there spoken of are regenerate men; what if it be spoken of men delivered from a corporal possession by the Devil (of which mention is made in the Verses before) and yet not from a spiritual possession? yet that makes more against the Confession, then your self. Therefore 3. let it pass, and I yield all, that [some regenerate men grieve the Spirit] so we are all apt to do too often [and shake the holy Spirit out of them] *viz.* in part, that is, part of his graces and comforts [and are again become guilty of the wrath of God, and of eternal punishments] so we are by every sin we commit, in regard of its desert [yea and be cast off by God] *viz.* in respect of the shining of his *face upon us* as formerly, and his *writing bitter* things against us in our consciences; you know who complained, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* It follows not from all this, that any regenerate man shall ever be *so cast off by God*, as that he shall suffer that *eternal wrath and punishment* which he deserves. You have hitherto sucked

no more out of the Churches of *Saxony*, then any Rock would have plentifully enough afforded you.

And the words after, [They again become liable to the wrath of God, and eternal punishment] are liable to the same exception with the former. I wis none of us deny our *liableness* to the [*wrath of God, and eternal punishment*] when we are at our *best*. *If thou Lord shalt be extream to mark what is done amiss, O Lord who shall stand?* Psal. 130. *But there is mercy with thee, therefore shalt thou be feared*, even when we are assured we shall be freed by thy mercy in Christs merits, from that, whereto of our selves we are alwaies too justly liable. And so I take my leave of *Saxony*, and prepare my self to wait upon you to *Dort*, as soon as you have made up your baggage in five considerable Conclusions.

In the mean time I cannot but stand a little amazed, that you had not found somwhat in the Articles of the Church of *England*, against our Doctrine of Perseverance, and made that good which you cast out in the first Chapter of this your Digression, that [Her first Reformers had two Nations strugling in their wombs about this point.] The truth is, the Article seems not so clear, but that Dr. *Reynolds*, and those Divines that were imployed together with him at the Conference of *Hampton* Court, would have had it explained; but not for any just exception against the words, but for prevention of a wilfull misconstruction of them, which they foresaw would be made in after-times; and accordingly they humbly desired, that the Articles of *Lambeth* (wherein these points were more dearer) might be added to the established Confession of faith. I conceive Dr. *Reynolds* understood the judgment of the first Reformers, all as well as Mr. *Goodwin*, and a little better then *F. G.* the late gracious Patron of *fur Predestinatus*. Nor was *A. Whitgift* to seek of it, nor would he have abetted Dr. *Whitaker* (as he did, at least at first) had Dr. *Whitaker* gainsaid the Received Doctrine: Nay the Censure of *Barret* by the University of *Cambridg* (as much as it hath beene censured by I know not whom, unless that Reverend and Godly *F.G.*) makes it manifest, what thoughts that University had of the constant judgment of the Church. And the Translators [resting the Scriptures to this Doctrine] (as M. *Goodwin* chargeth them more then once) is a farther argument, that they (who had I hope as good eyes as M. *Goodwin*) looked on this as a Doctrine whereof their *Mother* was very tender. Nay, and B. *Andrews* (who we may safely say was almost as knowing a man as M. *Goodwin*, and as zealous for the Church of *England*, as Mr. *Goodwin* can be against it) saith expresly in his judgment upon the nine Articles drawn up by Dr. *Whitaker*, *Certe nemo unquam dixerit (credo) fidem in Electis finaliter excidere*. Had any of the first Reformers said it, a thousand to one but B. *Andrews* had had some intelligence of it, or if no Chaplain had whispered it in his ear, yet *Bancroft* would have spoken it out to King *James*. But even he it seems was so far from having any incling of it, that when your good friend *Bertius* his Book *De Apostasia Sanctorum*, was first presented him, he was so taken with the wit of the man, that, as I have been told by no worse man then the Arch-Bishop of *Armah*, he said, the better to expres the absurdity of it, he should write another Book *De Castitate meretriciam*. It was not out of any conceit of novelty in Dr. *Whitakers* Articles, that King *James* had no mind to gratifie Dr. *Reynolds* and his brethren, by adding them to the 39 Articles; but questionless he denyed their suit upon some reasons of State, which I list not to enquire into, but am confident he built not upon those odd Principles of the Lord *Burley*, mentioned by *F. G.* which shew him to be as shallow a Divine, as he was a profound Politician. We use to say, the greatest Clerks are seldom the wisest men; and without offence, the wisest men are not alwaies as much as ordinary Clerks. But of these particulars I shall shortly have a fitter occasion to speak more fully in another Idiom.

In the mean time, I remember Dr. *Twiss* saith, King *James* was wont to Dignifie your *Arminius* with the Title of *that enemy of the grace of God*; and I have heard an old Prebend of *Winchester* (who was the first Divine that appeared in Parliament against the superstitious Innovations in the Church, about the year 1628. say, he waited on King *James*, when *Vorstius* his Book *de Deo* was first presented him, and that

the King was so exasperated, that he said to him, giving a fair testimony of *Vorstius* his Book against *Bellarmin*, that notwithstanding the good service he had done in *that work*, he would, had he had him upon the place, *thrust his head into the fire*; but however, how he lift his hand against *Vorstius*, the world hath sufficiently known. Had sundry of the first Reformers of this Church of *England*, been for your Doctrine, which holdeth so fair a correspondence with that of *Vorstius*, King *James* out of respect to them, would have been less rigid against him, then both his writings and endeavours for the convening of the Synod of *Dort* speaks him, and that lowdly enough in the ears of all the Christian world.

You at last sum up the principal results of these pregnant testimonies, and tell us [Five things are concludable from them above all contradiction,

1. That the Doctrine of absolute and unconditioned Perseverance, as it is commonly taught and believed among Professors at this day, and as it is stated and maintained in the writings of many Reformed Divines, over-honoured, many of them, with the stile of Orthodox] *viz.* Mr. *Goodwin* being the soveraign Judge and Moderator in all Causes Ecclesiastical [was not known or heard of by the name of Orthodox, in the Primitive and purer times of Christian Religion, nor owned or taught by any of the Learned Fathers, or Writers, for several centuries of years after Christ.]

Your *Conclusion* is too nimble for your *Premisses*; what if *you* have reckoned up *some* passages of the *Ancients*, and *Vossius*, from whom you borrowed them, *more*? I hope neither you nor he, have quoted *all the Ancients*, nor *all* that is found in the books of *those you have quoted*; and how then come you to conclude so *universally*, that [this Doctrine of Perseverance was not owned or taught, by *any* of the Learned Fathers, for several centuries of years after Christ?] I beseech you consider whether *some*, yea *most* of the Fathers of those years, *not teaching* it, will prove that *none* of *them* taught it; or whether *these passages* which you alleadg, prove that *these very Fathers* did *not teach it*. You may as well tell us, *Calvin* and *Martyr*, *Piscator* and *Junius* did not teach it, because you have found *some words* of *theirs*, which seem to sound against it, no less then those of *the Fathers*; nay you may say *none of our Divines at this day teach it*, because I dare say, *none of them* forbear to use *such words* as these you have quoted, at one time or other: So that it is clear, *your Conclusion* outleaps *your Premisses*; and by this *outleaping* (oh mysterious ill-luck) falls short of your purpose.

Your 2. Conclusion [That neither since the Reformation of Religion by *Luther* and his Compiers, hath it found entertainment with the generality, at least of that numerous party of Protestants, which for distinctions sake, are termed Lutherans] is fairly yielded by us, yet not proved by you neither; for what if *Melanthon* and *Chemnitius* be not for this Doctrine, is therefore the *Generality* of the Lutheran name against it? Dr. *Prideaux* his Credit is that which must help out this conclusion, it cannot stand without leaning upon his *Chair*, which yet you tell us in another place [weighs] not so much but that it may be overturned at any time by one or two arguments, such as *you* are wont to *produce*.

But surely upon the place, you overthrow much of the honour of his Chair, by a misrepresentation of his report concerning the Lutherans. I desire the Reader to have recourse to what hath been said before of both the *Lutherans judgment* in this point, and Dr. *Prideaux's judgment* of the Lutherans.

Your 3. Conclusion is [that this Doctrine of yours is by some of the most Learned and judicious followers of *Calvin* pregnantly, and with particularity of profession avouchsed] 1. This *Conclusion*, is I think just the same with your *Premisses*; and so it might have contented it self with the Title of a Repetition, and not have affected that of a Conclusion. *Musculus*, *Martyr*, *Aretius*, *Bullinger*, *Piscator*, *Deodat*, *Junius*, *Mollerus*, say somewhat for the Doctrine of Apostasie, *ergo* they say somewhat for the Doctrine of Apostasie; or [they have pregnantly, and with particularity of profession, avouched it,] *ergo* they have so avouched it.

Your

Your 4. Concluſion is, that [*Calvin* himſelf is conſtrained, ever and anon to give teſtimony to it.] This is much like your former Concluſion; and to both I ſhall return this, 1. That the *words which you quote*, have been found to ſignifie *no ſuch thing*. 2. The *like words* may be heard every day from *thoſe who mean no ſuch matter*. 3. You may as well ſay, *we are all of your judgment*, for *none of us* ſtick to uſe *ſuch words as theſe*, nor do they fall from us *inconſiderately* and *imprudently*, but upon ſerious deliberation, we find that they are of *uſe to our people*, no *prejudice* to *our Doctrine*. We ſay our Doctrine may *maintain all theſe expreſſions*, and never *undoe her ſelf*. It appears you do not know the *ſtate of it*, ſo well as you would ſeem to do.

Your 5 Concluſion is, that [your Doctrine hath been held by Counſels, Synods, and whole Proteſtant Churches alſo, in their Confeſſions] though you name but one, and that comes not up to your point neither.

For theſe five Concluſions, by a kind of *ſuperfatation*, there grows a *Sixth*, which though it be not ſtiled a *Concluſion*, yet is the *main* thing aimed at all along this worthy diſcourſe. [All which conſidered, we ſhall need no other demonſtration of the importune unreaſonableneſs and vanity of thoſe *ecſtatical* and wild Encomiums, or exorbitant depredications of the Doctrine of inevitable and unfruſtrable Perſeverance, which are found in the Writings, and heard from the mouthes of ſome of the over-zealous Admirers of it; as if for example, it were the fundamental Article of the Reformed Religion; one of the principal Points of Chriſtian Religion, wherein the Proteſtant Churches are purged from Popiſh errors, and which hath alwaies been maintained by the Reformed Churches, againſt Papiſts, the foundation of all true certainty of ſalvation, without which that fiducial and firm aſſurance, which is requiſite in and unto true believing, cannot ſtand; ſuch a Doctrine, which all true Miniſters of the Goſpel ought to inculcate into, and whet upon all true believers for their comfort, with many like ſwelling words of vanity. Doubtleſs if it be an error, and confederate againſt the holineſs and truth of the Goſpel (a crime which hath been by many competent and ſufficient witneſſes, proved againſt it) it is ſo far from meriting any of thoſe impotent acclamations lately ſpecified, that it really deſerves to have its portion with thoſe Merchants, and Money-changers, whom our Saviour, with a ſcourge, drove out of the Temple, as profaners of the Holy Deſigne and Counſel of God therein.]

Nay if it be guilty of ſuch *Treaſon* againſt the *Goſpel of God*, let it not only be *whipped*, but *hanged*, *drawn*, and *quartered*. Tuſh, what is it to have it [ſcourged with the money-changers out of the Temple] let it with the *Coyners of counterfeit money*, be ſent to *Tiburn*, there to receive whatever reward the wiſdom of Juſtice ſhal think fit to allot it: If this Doctrine be *guilty*, you are too *mild*, but if *not guilty* (as we truſt it will appear to any impartial Jury) you are as much too *cruel*. Well we hope thoſe [ſwelling words of vanity] are not altogether emptie of *truth*, and that this Doctrine may challeng little leſs then what they aſcribe to her.

But 1. Whoſe are theſe words? It is an argument of a ſpirit ſufficiently puffed up, to charge thoſe Reverend and Learned men which hold and Preach this Doctrine with [ſwelling words of vanity.]

2. When you have pricked theſe words with the beſt of your acumen, you will let out very little *vapour*, nor will they loſe of their *weight*, which we humbly conceive is more then their *ſwelling*. For albeit we call not this Point [*the Fundamental Article of the Reformed Religion*] yet may we ſafely affirm, that it is neerly *allied* to the Fundamental point. We look upon *Juſtification by faith*, as the *Fundamental Point*, in oppoſition to thoſe high thoughts which the Church of *Rome* hath of Works: concerning this faith, the *Reformed Churches* teach in oppoſition to that of *Rome*, *That Chriſtians not only may, but ought to aſſure themſelves of ſalvation*. Now how they ſhould *aſſure themſelves of ſalvation*, if their ſalvation be not *ſurely decreed to them*; and how *their ſalvation ſhould be ſurely decreed to them*, if their *perſeverance in faith be not ſo decreed*; and how they ſhould *know that their perſeverance is decreed*, ſave only by this, that *Gods decrees are known by his actings*, and promiſes of *future* actings in relation to *former*, who can imagin that he having *acted ſo far* upon our hearts,

as to renew us by a *lively faith*, and promised that where he hath *begun this work*, he will *perfect it unto the day of Jesus Christ*, here is a *promise* of our *preservation*, which *promise* supposeth a *decree* of our *preservation*, and that *decree*, though *unknown* in it *self*, yet may be known by the *effects of it*, and Gods *beginning* this good work, is an infallible argument that he hath *decreed to perfect it*. Thus this Doctrine of Perseverance lieth very *near* the [Fundamental Article of the Reformed Religion] & may well be stiled *one of the principal points wherein the Protestant Churches are purged from Popery*. It is so necessary to that point of *assurance of salvation*, which the *Reformed Divines generally teach*, not only as *possible* to be attained, but *necessary* to be *strived* for by *all believers*; that but for *this Doctrine of Perseverance*, it were *impossible* to be attained, and consequently it would argue as much *vanity* as is possible, to *attempt* it. You that can shew how men may be *competently assured of salvation* without being beholding to a *Decree of heaven*, and how they may find your Doctrine of Apostasie *more comfortable then that of perseverance*, may do much more then *other men* can *dream* of. We have no hopes to defend *assurance of salvation* against the Papists, without the necessary help of our *Doctrine of Perseverance*. And let me tell you, the Lutherans themselves, upon this occasion, speak as liberally of it as we.

Be pleased but to review the place which you mentioned in *Chemnitius Examen. de fide Justif. pag.* 172. *Quarto objiciunt* (*viz. Pontificii contra certitudinem fidei*) *etiam sententias de perseverantia; ut maxime de praesenti gratia certi sint credentes, neminem tamen certum esse an sit perseveraturus in finem; & quia illi soli salvi sunt, qui usque in finem perseverant, non igitur posse certam fiduciam esse de salute credentium.* He answers, *Petant perseverantiam — & hoc modo non debent* dubitare *de perseverantia, sed statuere juxta promissiones.* Phil. 1. &c.

Ha sententia manifeste ostendunt, spem fidelium de Perseverantiâ non esse inter cœlum, & terram, in ambiguâ dubitatione *suspensam.* Ibid.

Doctrina Monachorum, quæ jubet dubitare de Remissione peccatorum, & quidem in conversione, jubet remanere in dubitatione, falsa, impia, & Ethnica est, & revipsa delet Evangelium, saith your friend *Melanchthon, Disp. de Panit. Hab.* 4. *Oct.* 1548. in the second *Tome* of *Luthers* Works. These words seem to me to sound no less then those you have quoted.

SECT. 24. You are pleased for a close of this Chapter, and your whole Digression, to fall on [the Shield and Buckler of the Synod of *Dort.*] The first arrow which you shoot against it, though it want a *head*, yet wants not *poyson*, and that such, as there is but one man alive, at least of this Nation, that could possibly have furnished us with an Antidote against it. It is so shameless a Calumny, that you would seem to abhor to give credit to it; and to what purpose then I pray did you mention it?

[Far be it from me (say you) to subscribe the report or information of those, who charge the respective Members of this Synod, with suffering themselves to be bound with an Oath, at or before their admission hereunto, to vote down the Remonstrants and their Doctrines howsoever.] Whence I pray had you this Report? Why had you not named some one or other of the *Reporters*? you name none; and therefore may well be taken for the *Forger* of this Slander: Surely none of the Divines themselves have told you it; and it is as incredible they told others: Whence then come they to the knowledg of this secret? they must have it either from them *who took*, or them who *administred* this strange Oath, or those who were on the place; Tell us from which, and whether they *repented* of taking or administring this *Oath*, or not: It was not more easie to *cast out* such an accusation, then it is impossible to *prove it*. Yea say you [Far be it from me to subscribe the Report.] Why but because you have no colour of proof that there was such a report, you forsooth immediately insinuate, that you believe that there was such an Oath taken: [You seem to see the interest and obligation of an Oath, working in the Synod, much after the same manner, as it did in *Herod*, when for his Oaths sake, contrary to his mind and desire otherwise, he caused *John* the Baptists head to be given to *Herodias* in a Platter.]

Thus

Thus with the same breath, you profess *not to credit the report*, and yet to *see cause why to believe it*: so skilfull are you in the art of Calumniating, *aliquid hæret*. This dirt sure would have stuck so fast on the face of the Synod, in the eyes at least of your credulous Proselytes, that had it not been that God in his providence had left them one witness, beyond all exception, there had been no means to have wiped it off: But may you and your conscientious Confederates have patience to peruse the *Copy of a Letter*, which I shall here produce, from a hand of that General and unquestionable Authority, that the Christian world this day, yields not a greater. Though I should suppress the name of the Author, all *Britain* might know it by the *stile*.

Salutem in Christo.

VVorthy Mr. Kendall,

I Know not how to call it any better then a foul slander, which the Author of Redemption Redeemed hath been pleased to report, and would insinuate to believe, as cast upon the Divines of the Synod of Dort, *(of which number, my unworthy self, am now left only surviving) that they were foreingaged secretly by some forestalling Oath, to Vote against the Remonstrant Party, howsoever.* Cum bonis bene agier oportet. *Such sinfull baseness would have been heartily scorned by those grave and Godly persons. I call the God of heaven to record, that there was never any Oath tendred to us, but that Solemn and Publick one, which is Recorded in the History of the Synod; wherein every one of the Divines present, both native and forraign, did in all holy reverence, call God to witness, that he would proceed in the business, there and then agitated, uprightly and sincerely; and that he would judge and determine of those Points controverted, only out of, and according to the written word of God. If those Lynceau eyes can espie any error in this Oath, I must confess we have offended, else we are justly acquitted before God and men. Nay, to say more, we were never so much as in the least measure, moved or sollicited to incline either way; but were clearly left to our full freedom in this whole business, without the least whisper of any preoccupation; so as the imputation is no other then wickedly calumnious. My unhappy sickness called me off, before the full conclusion of that Work; but I staid so long as any publick Session, or appearance of the Remonstrants continued. Thus much in effect, I have formerly, upon the motion of my worthy successor at* Waltham, *Mr.* Fuller, *signified to him, though not yet extant, as one who cannot but think it was one end of this unexpected protraction of my dates, after all the rest of my fellows, that I might do this right to that Godly, Learned, Reverend Assembly; with the intimation whereof, I bid you farewell in the Lord, and do heartily commend your Studies to the Divine Benediction, professing my self,*

Higham, July 25. 1653.

Your loving, and much devoted Friend, *Jos. Hall*, B. N.

This

This *Letter* from *Higham*, weighes more then a *Volume* from *Colemanſtreet*; and ſhews what Letters he deſerves, that bluſheth not to babble any more of this Oath. So then the integrity of the Synod is cleared.

But next their *inſufficiency* in their managing of the buſineſs, (lack a day) you have ſo evidently demonſtrated [That to ſhew how far they fell below themſelves] and eſpecially below the more Renowned Theologue of *Colemanſtreet* [were but to redoe that which is done already;] but if you doe no more hereafter then you have done already, you will doe little, either to their diſparagement, or your own honour; and as much as you crack [they fall below themſelves,] and before you, you have not ſtood over-well before an incomparably weaker man; but though you goe for a Giant *Gog-magog* upon the Cliffs of *Dover*, yet I may ſafely ſay, I have given you a Corniſh hugg; let others judge how near you have tumbled over and over.

But laſtly, [With as much brevity as the Reader can well deſire, and in a regular proſecution of the deſigne of the Chapter in hand, you will ſhew how near they came in ſenſe, and ſubſtance of matter, to their adverſaries in the preſent queſtion; and leave it to Chriſtian conſideration, whether the difference between the two Combating Parties was of that latitude, or weight, that the one ſhould deſerve the beautifull Crown of Orthodoxiſm and honour, for their diſſent from their adverſaries, and the other the puniſhment, ſhame, and reproach, of perſons ſo deeply and deſperately erroneous, for their non-agreement with theirs.]

Queſtionleſs if the men agreed ſo well, as you ſaid learnedly but now, in the Points controverted, there was no reaſon, why they ſhould be ſo differently eſteemed; but the Point will appear not to be ſo ſmall, but that they ſtood at a ſufficient diſtance in it.

SECT. 25. For 1. What if the [Synod expreſly grant, that they who are under a poſſibility of falling, yea who will *de facto* fall away, (for their *non electis* ſignifie ſuch men as theſe) may be ſupernaturally enlightned, by vertue whereof, they may underſtand that thoſe things which are reported, or laid down in the word of God, are true, and do give an unfeigned aſſent unto them, *Act. Syn. Dord. par. 2. pag.* 188.] Does it follow, they grant as much as the Remonſtrants contended for? The *Remonſtrants* hold that the *Elect* may fall away, *any* of them, *all* of them; all that the *Synod* ſaith, is, that [ſome men who are *not elect*, may have ſuch *a ſupernatural illumination, as to underſtand* that *thoſe things which are laid down in the word of God are true, and accordingly aſſent unto them, and that this illumination notwithſtanding, they may fall away.*]

2. What if [the Synod add, that ſuch as theſe be enlightned with the ſupernatural knowledg of the truth of the Goſpel, which enlightning proceeding from the Holy Ghoſt, begets true knowledg in their minds, from whence, as oft as is needfull, they may act or work conformably to it?] The Remonſtranrs hold, that the *elect* may fall away, *any* of them, *all* of them. All that the Synod ſaith, is, that *ſome* men who are *not elect*, may attain to ſuch a meaſure of knowledg, by an enlightning proceeding from the Holy Ghoſt, and that this illumination and knowledg notwithſtanding, they fall away. The Remonſtrants hold, that *election* priviledgeth not men from *falling away*: The Synod holds, that men not priviledged from falling away, by vertue of election, may yet partake of a high meaſure of illumination; The Remonſtrants ſpeak undervaluingly of the *Elect*; the Synod ſpeaks at the higheſt of the *non elect*. Is this trow you, to agree, when they ſpeak not *ad idem*?

3. And what if [the Synod ſay further, *That the ſeed which fell upon ſtony ground, ſignifies ſuch hearers, who for a time believe, i. e.* who aſſent *unto the things revealed by God in the Goſpel; and that their aſſent in this kind was no waies counterfeit or feigned, appears from hence, that they received the word with joy?*] The Remonſtrants hold, that *any*, yea *all* the *elect may fall away* from their faith. The Synod ſaith but this, *that ſome believers who are not elect*, may *fall away*; the Remonſtrants invalidate the

the vertue of *Election* to preſerve *elect believers* from falling away. The Synod ſhews how far they may proceed in belief, who do *not partake in election*. This is the full agreement forſooth, which Mr. *Goodwin* ſo much cracks of between the Synod and the Remonſtrants. If the Members of his Church agree no better together, their *agreement* is rather the *diſtance of brethren a true* συμφωνία, a Conſort as harmonious as that of Harp and Harrow, or an Antheme upon Axes and Hammers.

Well, [but by the expreſs tenor of all this diſcourſe, moſt evident it is, that this Synod granteth a poſſibility of falling away, both totally and finally, in thoſe, at leaſt many of them, who by means of a ſupernatural illumination, and this wrought by the holy Ghoſt, come truly and unfeignedly to believe the Goſpel] *viz.* ſome points of it, [yea and to live and walk conformably unto it] *viz.* thoſe points which they believe, but of a full conformity, not a word; [ſo then, if it be made to appear, by the clear evidence of Scripture, that ſuch as theſe, *viz.* who truly and unfeignedly believe the Goſpel, live conformably unto it, *&c.*] *viz.* ſome points of it, [are true; and ſound believers, in an eſtate of juſtification, acceptation with God, *&c.*] *Quod reſtat probandum*, [it undeniably follows, that this Synod held the ſame with the Remonſtrants, whom yet they ground to powder with the weight of their ſentence, as moſt dangerouſly and deſperately erroneous. And the truth is, beſides this of perſeverance, an intelligent Reader may eaſily find] by the help of Mr. *Goodwins* ſpectacles [that in other points alſo, as in the queſtion about *the extent of Chriſts death*, the *extent of ſaving grace*, &c. they deliver and maintain the ſame things, with the perſons ſentenced by them.] *Quare* whether the ſame things for which they ſentenced thoſe perſons? elſe you and I agree well enough in ſome things, though we differ as much in others, relating to, but diverſe from them wherein we unanimouſly agree. [And if not formally, in plainneſs and expreſſneſs of terms, though ſometimes they want very little even of this;] What ſilly fools were they in the mean time, and how Synodically did they determine, if Dr. [redacted] be infallible? [yet arguitively, in grounds and principles manifeſtly bearing, and iſſuing forth the ſame Concluſions.] You ſhould have added, *according to your and your Churches Logick*. How ſoon is this ſorry Synod blown up by an impotent vapour? Alas what ſhould you trouble your ſelf, with an unneceſſary anſwer to their contemptible Arguments, which you ſufficiently *confuted* by *preſenting* them in the end of this Book? you will queſtionleſs but ſpoil too much good paper, in publiſhing another Volume againſt them. You had beſt ſave your ſelf the pains of writing, and the world of reading any more of it,

——Jacet Ilium, & ingens
Gloria Dardanidum, parte jacet inclytus Hector.

Your victorious breath, which makes a more formidable noiſe then that of *Joſhuah's new faſhion'd Trumpets*, hath laid this *Jericho ſo low*, that no man may preſume to hope, to ſee *one ſtone* of it ever ſtand again upon *another*: But however let all the ſtones be thrown at your *forehead*, it is ſo ſignally impenetrable, that it diſdains to admit the leaſt ſhadow of impreſſion. Loe here a *Goliah* for the nonce, who inſtead of a *Weavers Beam*, contents himſelf with a *ſpattle*, and looks the moſt glorious Hoaſt of the God of heaven down to the ground. All the Kettles in *Colemanſtreet* will not ſuffice for *Drums* at this triumph, nor any other *Chair*, but a new *Sella curulis*, after the cut of Porphyry, one for him to be carried in in a meet ſolemnity, upon the ſhoulders of his learned admirers and adorers. What undeſerved honor did he vouchſafe to put upon *Cambridge*, when he condeſcended ſo low as to Challeng her *Heads*, having given all the *Members* of the Synod of *Dort*, to the *fowles of the air*, and the *beaſts of the field*? and yet this huge Conqueſt ſtood him no more then a big *look*, *vidit*, *vicit*.

But what was this ſame thing which we call the *Synod of Dort*? ruſh; not half ſo venerable an Aſſembly, as that which uſed to be ſummoned at *Swann Alley*: What was *Carletons* Rochet, to ſome of your more Reverend Green Aprons? or what were

were *Davenants*, *Halls*, *Wards*, *Goads*, *Scarlet Hoods*, to some learneder *Stammin Petticoats*?

And for the Dutch Divines, alas they were a *dull pack*; *Batavorum ingenia*. What were they, *Min heers*, yea *Hogen Mogens*, to the *Cockneyshire wits*? to blow off all these, a little back-breath is enough, it was below such a Champion as you, to take notice of them so far as to *face* them. Any single *Pigmy* is an over-match for this poor handfull of *Cranes*; the cocking of such a Beaver as yours, is enough to fright down all their *Bucklers and Shields*, your short *ipse Dixit*, confounds them all in an *eternal silence*. Judge Reader, how much reverence his face may command, which dasheth such a Synod out of *countenance*.

Dixit, & ostendit signum fatale Minervæ.

Well but [though it could not be proved from the Scriptures, that the persons subjected to a possibility of a total and final Apostasie, by the Synod, are true and real believers; yet if they were, or be such, in the sense and judgment of the Remonstrants (which is apparent enough that they were and are) the Synod had no cause to fall foul upon them] as you had questionless to do on the Synod [as erroneously dissenting from them in the point of Perseverance, but only as dissenters or erroneous, in judging or discerning the difference, between sound and unsound believers, or between persons justified and not justified.] And why so? The question is, *Whether true believers be not preserved by that God that elected them from all eternity, to salvation*? The Remonstrants affirm *they are not*, undervaluing the power of God, denying the *purpose* of God to do it; and to prove this, they produce instances of *believers who have fallen away*; the Synod saith, *These believers were not elected, not true believers* with *such a faith* as is *that of Gods elect*, *that* else they had not *fallen away*. This is but a *subquestion*, *whether these believers had true justifying faith*: the *main controversie is about the falling away of such as have true justifying faith*; and if to prove *that*, the Remonstrants subsume *this*, shall the Synod be said not to deal fairly, because they forsake not their *main hold*, and lay out all their strength upon this *outwork*? Sir, the foundation which the Synod laies for the perseverance of the Saints, is not so much in the *firmness of the Saints faith*, as the *effectualness of Gods decree*, the *faithfulness of his promise*, the *just performance of it in his continual supplies of grace*, so as to *keep his Saints from falling*, or to *raise them being fallen*. The Remonstrants forsooth must have leave to speak their pleasure against *all these*, and the whole dispute must be reduced to *this one* punctilio, *Whether those Apostates had true faith*? No, the Synod had just cause to oppose them in *all*; nor was this [to fall fowl upon them] to stand for *these precious truths of God*, and *priviledges of the Saints*. The Remonstrants used *this* as *their sword*, ergo the Synod dealt foully in not casting away *their own swords and bucklers*, and only trying it out bravely, whether they could wrest the *sword* out of the *hand of their adversarie*. This is for none but such doubty Champions as your self: I doubt whether you would be content to be restrained to such terms. For instance, there was lately a question (as you may please to remember) between you and your brethren, *Whether the Civil Magistrate among us be bound to interpose for the defence of the purity of Religion*? Mr. *Goodwin* (whose tender care of the Magistrate, lest he should be unseasonably overloaden, with this heavie, but unprofitable burthen, put him upon the great pains of drawing up certain little Quæries to this purpose) among others, he hath *one* more considerable then the *rest*, *Whether the Christian Magistrate be more bound in conscience to maintain the Christian Religion, then the Mahometan Magistrate is to maintain the Mahometan Religion*? And surely if he be *not more bound*, he is *bound* so *slightly*, that he may *lose* himself of his *bonds*, and cast the cords from him, whenever Mr. *Goodwin* shall in his Godly wisdom, advise him to it, all the Votes and Acts of the late Parliament to the contrary notwithstanding, as being all repealed, or expired of course, upon the sudden appearance of those unanswerable quæries of this new tender Father of the Church, and old stout Son of the State.

Now if I (for want of other work) were to deal with Mr. *Goodwin* upon *that queſtion of the duty of the Magiſtrate among us in matters of Religion*, ſhould, balking all his other quæries, preſs him to ſtick meerly to this, and to prove againſt me, that *the Chriſtian Magiſtrate is no more bound to maintain Chriſtian Religion, then the Mahometan is to maintain Mahometan Religion*, would he ſay that I dealt *fairly* with *my own* Cauſe, or that I fell the leſs *foully* upon *his*? Sure I had dealt with him much as the Lady *Abbeſſe* did with the Devil, when ſhe confined him, poor fiend, to her cloſe-ſtool, where this piece of the paper of *Q*uæries would have been a uſefull commodity for him. Why Sir, is it *foul play* not to leave the *principal thing in queſtion*, and deal wholly upon that which *occaſionally interpoſeth* it ſelf, though with never ſo much *importunity*? Say in this preſent *Digreſſion* of yours, I ſhould have waved *all the reſt* of your Diſcourſe, and have engaged only upon *that choice notion* of yours, that *the Doctrine of the Apoſtaſie of the Saints is much ſweeter and comfortabler then that of their Perſeverance*, had I dealt ever the *fairer* with either *your* Cauſe or *mine own*? But this of the unhandſom carriage of the impertinent Synod, *you* ſaid only *by the way*, and I have gone out *of the way* too farre to follow it.

[That the perſons liabled by the Synod, to a defection from faith, both *total* and *final*, as *viz.* ſuch who being ſupernaturally enlightned] viz. *in ſome particulars*, [have the true knowledg of God] viz. *ut prius*, [unfeignedly believe the Goſpel] *ut ſupra* ſtill, [act conformably] to their faith, *i. e.* unſoundly, [have their affections in part changed] in *one* part *changed*, and in *moſt* part *unchanged*, [their lives in part reformed] and in *more* part *unreformed*, [their perſons in part renewed, *&c.* after the rate above, [are by the Scriptures adjudged for true and ſound believers, for perſons truly juſtified, *&c.* is ſo apparent, that to me there ſeems no place left for doubting, unleſs haply prejudice, or anticipation of judgment makes room for any man in this kind] SECT. 26.

God keep me from the *heaven* of *ſuch true* and ſound *believers*; and if I ſhould wiſh *you* may come *there* among them, I ſhould betray more uncharitableneſs, then in judging that all theſe believers, ſo *ſound* that they are all *rotten at the core*, ſo *true*, that they are *falſe* on the *inſide*, have their deſerved portion on the *other ſide of the gulf*. Nor am I led to this apprehenſion, by [any preoccupation or prejudice] but the *Scripture* hath warranted me to conceive, that *ſuch believers* as *theſe*, forſooth, who give the Devil ſo *many inches* in them, will find he will take *whole ells*, *poſſeſs himſelf* of ſo *much of them*, that the Spirit of God will not endure to *dwell ſo near him*. See I pray, what Character the *ſilly Synod* is pleaſed to give of them,

Adhuc enim vitioſarum quibus indulgent cupiditatum fibras, radiceſque, funditus defixas retinent, amore terrenorum penitius afficiantur, & duritiei in imis cordium receſſibus latens non auferatur, &c. and afterwards, *Produnt ſe φιλαύτους, ac potius φιλησδόνους, magis quam φιλοθέους, nihilque minus quam Deo frui, quicquid ſibi falſo per ſuadeant, ſed revera uti voluiſſe Deo, ut fruantur mundo, ut alicubi Auguſtinus.* Again, *Nunquam ſeriam panitentiam agunt, nunquam ſerio dolore afficiuntur, hoc ipſo, quod peccando Deum offenderint, humilem cordis contritionem non attingunt; nec ſincerum propoſitum de non peccando impoſterum concipiunt; iis non datur reſipiſcentia ad vitam, &c. non dolor ille ſecundum Deum, cujus nunquam paniteat; non ſunt pauperes ſpiritu, &c.* And what wonder if *ſuch believers* have no part in *that kingdom of heaven* for which their over-zealous advocate, hath I hope, reſolved to prepare himſelf.

Onwards ſtill the Synod proceeds to repreſent them as ſuch as have never any ſerious deſire of reconciliation to God, and ſpeaks as if it had been in the boſoms of them, *nunquam ſerium in ſe ſenſit deſiderium reconciliationis*, *never hunger nor thirſt after righteouſneſs; do not deny themſelves, not renounce their luſts, not deſpiſe all things for Chriſt.* Loe what Saints theſe are, Saints and it were for the *black Rubrick*; ſuch *Saints* as never had (ſaith the Synod) *fidem vivam, & ανυπόκριτον*, the peculiar of the *elect*.

thinks here I see how you fall presently upon the secure Synod, and twit their weakness, with forgetting what they said of late, of *fides minime simulata*, found in these your rare Saints of the *Hagiomastical Canonization*: But it is presently answered, that *fides Dogmatica*, is *one*, and *Practica another*; they might unfeignedly assent to much of the *Doctrine* held forth in the word of God, but so as to *detain the truth in unrighteousness*; their *apprehensions* of the *Doctrine*, were not seconded with suitable *applications*. The *Doctrine* in their *heads*, was not attended with a *fit use* in their *hearts*; they cleansed the *outer man commendably*, the *inner* part *perfunctorily*; they did but slightly *wipe*, instead of *brushing*; or but *brush* instead of *rubbing*; or *rubbed* it too *gently*, for fear of *rending*, which alone could *amend* it. They gave, if you please, an *unfeigned consent* to the *Doctrine*, but did not *seriously enough consider it*; and the *more* they *consider it*, the *less* they *affect* it, as discovering how it *thwarteth* and *crosseth* their *bosome-lusts*, and many of which they account not *sins against God*, but a kind of *duties* to *themselves*. Shortly they do *unfeignedly assent to the truth* at first sight, and at a distance, but they do not *soundly apprehend it*; and the *more* they know *whereto it tends*, the *less* they think it worth the *following*, and at last alwaies forsake it, and sometimes oppose it; yea now and then feigne an *ignorance of that*, whereto they formerly gave *an unfeigned assent*. These forsooth are your *true believers*. Yea but [the Scripture (say you) makes not only the collection, or joynt concurrence of the particulars specified, a distinguishing character of true and sound believers, from those who are not such; but some of them even singly and apart from others: As 1. a *true and unfeigned belief or assent unto the things revealed by God in the Gospel*,] yes, if you understand it of *all the main things*; but that these your *true believers* did *truly assent* to *all these*, who can believe; who considers how they prefer their accommodations in *this world*, before the glory of *that to come*? how far they are from thinking that the *gaining* of *heaven*, is worth the *losing* of what they have on *earth*; that *suffering for Christ* is an *happiness*; and that *all they have*, is worth *nothing*, but only in this respect, *that they have somewhat to leave for Christ*?

Well, but to prove that a true and unfeigned belief of the things revealed by God in the Gospel, is of it self a character of a true believer, [you quote John 20. 31. *These things are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name.*] And how manage you this Text?

Why [1. There is nothing more evident, then that the word of God doth report and declare, that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*,] undeniable.

[1. It is here plainly asserted, that to believe this (at least with a true and unfeigned belief) is available unto life or salvation.] True, *available*, that is *conducing*; but what, *available* so as to to be *sufficient*? It is well you explain your self, [*to believe this with a true and unfeigned belief*;] but what is that? To believe that we were all of our selves liable to eternal death, and under an utter impossibility of being delivered, either by what our selves, or any other creature could do or suffer; that God out of his infinite mercy, sent his Son to die in our stead, by his death to purchase our pardon, yea adoption for us, that *we might be made the sons of God, and heirs of an everlasting kingdom in heaven*, where both our *souls*, after their *dissolution* from our *bodies*, and our *bodies*, after their *resurrection* out of the *dust*, shall be partakers of unconceiveable and endless glory; that hereupon we owe God our selves, our souls and bodies, and are happie in being enabled by his *grace*, to employ our several faculties and members in his *service*; and more in being honoured to *suffer* the most fearfull measure from *men*, for being *faithfull* to *God*. This is all included in *believing that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, as is declared in Scripture.

Now I ask 1. Do you conceive that every one that unfeignedly assents to this truth, *that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, taken in the *lump*, doth as truly assent to *all the truths* that are necessarily *involved* in it? Possibly a man may assent to that truth, *that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, for the sake of the world; as the case stands at present among us, and upon an apprehension that wiser men among us see just ground

round for it, as generally subscribing this truth, although he see little or none: that this is rather not to express a dissent, then unfeignedly to assent to it. But whosoever *unfeignedly assent to the truth*, as I have opened it, with *a true faith*, shall surely be *saved*.

But 2. Do you think that these your *true believers* did *so* assent to it? Those whom the Synod speaks of, *never desired reconciliation*, *never thirsted after righteousness*, *never valued Christ before all things*; loe what kind of sorry assent these men gave to the things declared in the Gospel. Was this the faith [for the effecting or working whereof the Gospel was written?] true, it was written to give even an assent at large, and *without such an assent*, no salvation; but such an assent is not *sufficient* I trow to salvation? even *such an assent* is *necessary*, but there is *another gates* assent *required* to salvation? Is it [to bring an evil and hard report on the Gospel] to say such an assent at large to it was *intended*, and yet such was *not intended* as *sufficient* to salvation?

Nay but you add [The same truth is asserted in many other places, 1 *John* 5.5. *Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?* To overcome the world, is an unquestionable character of a person justified, and in favour with God; and *whosoever* saith *John believes that Jesus is the Son of God, partakes in this glory*, is *victorious over the world*.] What? every one who believes at large, that *Jesus is the Son of God*, after the proportion of those believers spoken of, by the Synod, and so much pleaded for by you? How well these men *overcame the world* appears by this, that *they valued not Christ above all things*. Mark I pray, St. *John* saith not, *every one that believes that Jesus is the Son of God, overcomes the world*; but *every one that overcomes the world*, *believeth that Jesus is the Son of God*. None doe overcome the world without such a *belief* at large, that belief is necessary to the *overcoming of the world*, it is not in the mean time sufficient to it. *Who is he that overcomes the world, but he that so believes?* he saith not, *whosoever believes and overcometh not the world*; and so though *such believing alwaies go before overcoming the world*; yet alas, *overcoming the world* doth not *alwaies follow after such a believing at large*, that *Jesus is the Son of God*; as which I believe is at most but a humane faith.

You proceed, [Again the Lord Christ, having a little before his ascension, Commissioned his Disciples thus, *Go you into all the world, and preach the Gospel unto every living creature*, he immediately subjoyneth, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved*; *but he that believeth not, shall be damned*. That believing which our Saviour here requireth, and unto which he promiseth salvation, is doubtless no other faith or believing, but a true and unfeigned belief of that Gospel, which his Apostles, in the words immediately preceding, were injoyned to preach unto the world.] Right; but that I had thought contained not only a *History of Christ*, but the mysterie of *Godliness*. Now a man may possibly believ the first *after a fashion*, and yet not the latter, and a *Dogmatical* faith (which is that that the Synod speaks of) is many times destitute of the company of *that faith* which *worketh by love*. And why may it not be said without offence, that the *first faith*, though it be such, as without which there is *no coming to heaven*, yet is not such as will prevail to *bring any man thither*? What you say afterward of [A true and unfeigned admission, or reception of the Gospel, or all the Apostles preached into the heart and soul of a man, that it transflates a man from death to life, *&c.*] is all true, but impertinent. We deny that those believers spoken of by the Synod, admitted the *main Doctrine of the Cross of Christ into their souls*. the *necessity* that there was of *Christs death* for us, the necessity of *our dying with Christ*, the glory of *our suffering for him*, are mysteries which they were strangers to, as not *seriously desiring reconciliation*, *not denying themselves*, *not prizing Christ above all things*, and so not holding *all things as dung* in comparison of *him*.

Prove as much as you list, that [A faith, so true and cordial, as to be attended with incumbency on Christ, renouncing of the world, *&c.* is a true justifying faith, albeit (forsooth) that recumbency be not the essence, or as much as any part of this faith] you do not help your self, unless you prove these believers spoken of by the Synod, SECT. 27.

who did not ſeriouſly deſire reconciliation, nor heartily thirſt after righteouſneſs, had a *faith attended with a recumbency on Chriſt, and renouncing the world*; and what you quote gravely from *Melanchthon*, amidſt this heap of teſtimonies, abundantly ſhews that *notitia Hiſtoria* [the notice of the Hiſtories] as you render it moſt Clark-like, is not ſufficient. Faith that juſtifies is ſuch as is in the *heart*, as well as the *head*; no other faith juſtifies, but ſuch as is uſhered in with a *ſelf-condemnation*, and humble acknowledgment of the juſtice of God, in whatever ſentence he ſhould have pleaſed to have paſſed on us. Now whereas you tell us,

SECT. 28. That [The Remonſtrants never wound up their pens, to ſo high a ſtrain againſt the neceſſity of the Perſeverance of the Saints, as the Synod hath done, which affirms a neceſſity of the falling away of the *non electi*.]

I anſwer, That thoſe *non electi* are no Saints, but only in *profeſſion*, nor doth the Synod hold a neceſſity of their falling away from their *profeſſion* of Saintſhip, but a neceſſity of their *periſhing*, though they continue in that unſincere profeſſion; which though it be ſuch as renders them Saints in the eyes of men (which can take little cognizance of their hearts, and are in charity to judge the beſt) yet never approved them for ſuch unto God, whoſe pure eyes clearly diſcovered the falſeneſs of their hearts, when their profeſſion was at the faireſt. Their *aſſent* was but a kind of *aſſentation*; and they did but *flatter with their lips, and diſſemble in their double hearts*. So then the Synod hath not [ſtumbled at the ſtone of inexcuſableneſs] but Mr. *Goodwin* is unexcuſable for caſting theſe *ſtones*, or rather this *dirt* at them.

SECT. 29. I confeſs, had you proved that the *non electi*, had had true juſtifying faith by the confeſſion of the Synod, they had been guilty of your [Indictment] but this they expreſly deny to them, *Non electi huc uſque progreſſi ad ſtatum tamen adoptionis, & juſtificationis, nunquam perveniunt; ac proinde ex horum Apoſtaſia, perperam deducitur Sanctorum Apoſtaſia Suffr. Brit. de Quinto Art. Theſ.* 4.

Well but [they ſay of ſome of theſe *non electi*, that they have the true knowledg of God, and of Chriſt, or of God in Chriſt, in their mind, for what other knowledg they ſhould here mean, is not imaginable, but they mean it only of ſuch as they call Dogmatical, and that out of this knowledg, they may as oft as is needfull, is not this conſtantly and without turning aſide, act conformably? And what is this but to bring forth fruits worthy repentance, yea and to equalize the beſt and worthieſt of the Saints, in doing righteouſneſs, which the holy Ghoſt makes the moſt emphatical and unerring property or character of ſuch men?] Nay they ſay not that theſe *non electi* may out of this knowledg [as oft as is meet, act conformably to the Goſpel;] but that they did as oft as was meet, act conformably to *this knowledg*; but as *this knowledg* was but *Dogmatical*, ſo were their actions in conformity to it, ſomewhat, yea much below thoſe which a *practical knowledg* would have produced; and that they did not act [as oft as was need conformably to the Goſpel] appears by their Apoſtaſie. The Synod ſpeaks not of theſe *non electi* as being qualified to doe [as often as was needfull, yea or any time, according to the Goſpel;] but as oft and as far as was needful, *viz.* in *their judgments*. The Synod had been guilty, not only of [*Autocataciſie* againſt their judgment] as you charge them, but of ridiculous abſurdity and contradiction to common ſenſe, had they affirmed theſe *non electi* acted [as often as was needfull according to the Goſpel] and yet apoſtatized from it. To do righteouſneſs, it is true [is an unerring character of a Saint;] but then you muſt conſtrue it, of doing that which is righteous, as righteous, *righteouſly*, which, that ever theſe *non electi* did, is not ſaid by the Synod. *Actus elicitbant*, ſay they, *quoties opus erat conformiter*

Theſe actions, as conformable as they were for the *matter*, were not ſo for the *manner* of doing. And accordingly the Synod compares theſe acters of righteouſneſs to the *ſtony ground*, and that [the perſons Parabled thereby, were true Saints] as much as you boaſt, you have not at all proved. Let the Reader be pleaſed to compare your Arguments, and my Anſwers to them.

You

You draw up the ſum of this your Copious Digreſſion; but all the Particulars ha- SECT. 30
ving been ſhewed to be but Ciphers, let any man judg how much the Total amounts to; only I muſt needs ſay, how little ſoever you have done, you have undertaken enough, and deſerve the honour of *magnis excidit auſis*: So may they all proſper, that ſhall preſume to ſet themſelves againſt the *faithfulneſs of God*, and *comfort of his Saints*, who repoſe all their hope, not in *their own performances*, which they are ready to abaſe even to hell, but in *Gods promiſes*, which are all *yea and amen*. He who *ſits in heaven*, hath engaged himſelf to bring every Saint on earth *thither*; the *great God* hath taken upon him, the *care* of the *leaſt of his little ones*; nor can his children diſhonour him more, then to think he will neglect it, ere *they can fall away*, *his word muſt paſs away*; ſooner ſhall *heaven and earth*, then the leaſt *tittle of it*.

I have now done with Mr. *Goodwin*, only I cannot be ſo uncivil, as not to ſay this at parting, That I have not been ſo much his *profeſſed adverſary*, But that I am much more his *devoted ſervant*, for thoſe excellent parts, which notwithſtanding all my pleaſantneſs with him, I do ſeriouſly acknowledg in him, and moſt heartily pray God, that they may be ſo ſanctified unto him, that he may have the happineſs to enjoy that precious priviledg of the Saints, which in this diſpute he hath ſo induſtriouſly ſtrained himſelf to oppoſe, and that we may both meet in heaven, where there will be no more controverſie between us.

In the mean time may every Saint ſay, *Return unto thy reſt O my ſoul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee. O what fearfull things hath he ſhewed me, yet did he return, and refreſh me, and bring me out of the depth of hell again. He hath delivered mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling, that I might walk before him in the land of the living. Thou art his ſervant, the ſon of his handmaid, he hath broken thy bonds aſunder, therefore perform thou the vowes which thou madeſt to him in the daies of thy trouble, and ſet forth his goodneſs in the gates of the daughter of Sion. Let Iſrael rejoyce in him that made him, and let the children of Sion be joyfull in their King for the Lord takes pleaſure in his people and the meek will he beautifie with ſalvation. The enemies thruſt ſore at us, that we may fall, but in the name of the Lord ſhal we deſtroy them. They compaſs us about like bees, but in the name of the Lord ſhall we deſtroy them. Let them that fear the Lord, truſt the Lord, he is their help and their ſhield. Let Iſrael hope in the Lord, he is their help and their ſhield: He keeps the feet of his Saints, and will exalt the horn of his anointed. He rebuketh even Kings for their ſakes, ſaying, Touch not mine anointed, and do my Prophets no harm, he gives his Angels charge over them as miniſtring Spirits to them, he preſerves them by his own power through faith to ſalvation, and glories to have his ſtrength made perfect in their weakneſs. Whom have we in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that we deſire beſides thee. Our fleſh and our heart fails, but thou art the ſtrength of our heart, and our portion for ever. Thou ſhalt uphold us by thy right hand, thou ſhalt lead us by thy grace, and after receive us to glory,*

2 Cor. 4.7. *We have this treaſure in earthen veſſels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.*

2 Cor. 12.9. *Moſt gladly will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Chriſt may reſt upon me.*

FINIS.

FINIS

A FESCUE FOR A Horne-Book, OR AN APOLOGY FOR UNIVERSITY-LEARNING, AS NECESSARY FOR COUNTREY-PREACHERS.

SINCE this Book was all wrought off the PRESSE, I had the opportunity to see a Digression of Mr. *Horne's* against me; which though extream shrewd, is sufficiently short; so that as desperately as it pusheth, it is so farre from *giving*, that it scarce *prickes* me. This piece of Master *Horne* is not as much as a *Thorne*.

First, It takes to taske an objection of mine against Mr. *Goodwin*, ingenuously confessing that I propound it only as *Argumentum ad hominem*, and so it seemes lay no stresse on it as to the *matter* of it. Only this Digressor, 1. Apprehends, *It may seem to carry some shew of Weight in it amongst some of the Antipodeanists, that believe the extent of Christs death and ransome.* He should have added some epithet to his *extent*, for want whereof I think few will know how to make out his *sense*; *I trow all confesse an extent of Christs death*, the question is, *how farre* it extends? And, 2. *Calls to minde, that it is a prime Argument amongst some of them*; what is that to me? And thereupon, 3. Conceives it *very unreasonable how he is invalidity*. In good time. [*It is then* (saith he) *to this purpose*, Christ by his death and suffering, hath wholly dissolved, and taken off from all men, the guilt and condemnation, that was brought on all men by *Adams* sin, and so from all Infants, so as that none shall perish now, but for his own personal sinning against the Government and goodnesse of God by Christ; Therefore as *Tertullian* saith, *Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem?* seeing Infants are not in danger of perishing, nor